

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, December 11, 1899.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read, corrected, and approved.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the special order which has been assigned as the business of the House for to-day.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, December 11, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. No. 1, entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes;" general debate thereon shall continue to not later than 5 o'clock p. m. of Friday, the 15th day of December, and thereafter debate under the five-minute rule until 5 o'clock p. m. of Saturday, the 16th day of December, at which time the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with any amendments adopted by the committee, and a vote shall be taken on the bill and amendments, if any, without intervening motion, to final passage, immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday, the 18th day of December. And during said debate the House shall on each day adjourn not later than 5 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House which has just been read by the Clerk, the House will now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the financial bill, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will please take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, this country presents the anomalous situation of being the absolute and unchallenged leader in almost every field of advanced thought, whether in science or literature; certainly the most advanced in material development and the control of trade; by far the superior in manufactures and growth of markets; and yet it is the field of greatest controversy upon the subject of the standard of value and the proper media of exchange.

No nation has devoted more time to public discussion and legislative consideration of the question of finance than the United States. The past twenty-five years has witnessed the greatest interest in the subject of any similar period in the history of the nation, and during the past four years every possible phase of the subject has been presented. Continued discussion very naturally develops various proposals for remedy of actual and fancied evils, and the time seems ripe for an honest and careful effort at a fair solution of the problem.

Notwithstanding the fact that the so-called money question continues in great interest among our people, and notwithstanding there have been occasions when serious doubt clouded the situation and produced grave fears lest the entire fabric of our monetary system might be seriously shaken, yet it is to the great credit of the Government that every dollar of our money in circulation is absolutely sound and unquestioned. Throughout the entire time of troublous discussion and debate, in periods when public confidence had well-nigh disappeared and panics produced serious dangers, as well as in the periods of our greatest prosperity, every dollar of American money has been at a parity with the best dollar in circulation. This condition has led many people into the erroneous belief that there was no need for legislation, and that the best that the Government could do would be to let the subject alone.

Such people are not familiar with the frequent pledges of the Government to maintain the parity of our money, declaring by Congressional acts the honest purpose of the Government to faithfully and surely guarantee the full parity of all money in circulation. The present parity depends entirely upon such declarations and guarantees, but its maintenance and enforcement rest with the judgment or caprice of the Secretary of the Treasury, who, by a single order directing the use of silver in the discharge of our obligations, may completely destroy the parity and shift the standard to the metal so used. It seems far better to attempt a proper regulation of the question by a clear and permanent statute rather than depend upon occasional declarations by the Government of its intention. It is far better to end the matter by a public law, which shall be plain and unequivocal, rather than rely upon proposals of what may or shall be done at some future date, or leave so dangerous an option within the control of one man, whether he be the President or his financial adviser.

OUR MONEY AND ITS HISTORY—FORMS OF MONEY.

All of our money in the United States is under Federal control, and the laws authorize ten different kinds, namely, gold coins, gold certificates, standard silver dollars, silver certificates, Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, subsidiary silver, United States notes (greenbacks), national-bank notes, nickels, and coppers. Each kind is in circulation to-day, all at parity, every dollar equal in purchasing and debt-paying power. Gold coins, standard silver dollars, and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, are full legal tender. United States notes (greenbacks) are full legal tender, except for duties on imports and interest on the public debt. Subsidiary silver is legal tender for amounts not exceeding \$10, and nickels and coppers are legal tender to the extent of 25 cents. Gold certificates, silver certificates, and national-bank notes are not legal tender.

The legal-tender quality adds no value to the money, but merely makes provision whereby debts may be discharged by the tender of specific kinds of money which, being good, the creditor is bound to accept. It is for convenience and to avoid embarrassment which a capacious creditor might cause by insisting upon any special character of payment, or which a capacious debtor might create by making payment in a character of money at the time greatly inconvenient to the creditor. I do not deny but that there are those who claim that legal tender adds value, nor that governments have repeatedly undertaken to supply a deficiency in money by giving it the legal-tender quality and attempting to force it into circulation.

The universal and absolute failure of all such efforts is sufficient evidence that this quality is not a quality of value. There is not a single instance in the history of finance where the legal-tender quality added to a money has enabled it to circulate at a greater value than its intrinsic value, where it does not possess equally the pledge and faith of the government for its full redemption. The history of government efforts to force legal-tender money into circulation irrespective of its intrinsic value and without the government pledge is a record of failures, without a single exception. All of the various kinds of money in the United States are based upon a common standard of value, in which each can be measured. The present standard of value in this country is gold, and has been so recognized in practice for more than half a century.

THE STANDARD.

Money is a medium of exchange, and where there are different varieties there must be a common measurement of value. Whether this standard is sought to be controlled by the statute or left exclusively to the laws governing trade and commerce, nevertheless there is, and always has been, in every community dealing in trade, a common method of measurement whereby articles of value are exchanged. This proposition is almost self-evident and is universally admitted. It is only when effort is made to control by statute such measurement of value, different from the method pursued in common trade, that confusion arises.

There can be no proper and valid exchange unless the tool of measurement regulating the exchange shall be equally acceptable to both parties. The basic principle of exchange is value. The question of convenience, of immediate use, of human need or desire may be involved, but nevertheless the basic principle is value; and where there is not an absolute exchange of property for property, the standard of measurement or unit of value which acts as the common tool of exchange must in itself contain the element of value. The element of value is just as essential to a standard of value as the element of weight to a standard of weight or of length to a standard of measurement. Firmness, stability, and constancy are characteristics which any standard must possess if it shall meet the demand upon it by universal use for honest and true measurement, whether of value, weight, or length—firmness in adherence to the principle and purpose to which it is dedicated, stability in its individual strength, and constancy in its character to preserve its integrity. Adaptability to the uses of trade, simplicity of terms to meet the requirements of small transactions equally with large concerns, and uniformity of reputation are qualities necessary to the successful operation of any standard.

There can be but one standard of measurement at a given time. An attempt to couple two standards differing in any degree in essential characteristics will shift the standard to the weaker link. If the basis of a standard of value should be two metals, each possessing characteristics essential to true measurement, there would still be, in effect, but one standard. Value is determined by such a multitude of circumstances, bearing such complex relations to each other, influenced by supply and demand, utility, adaptability, human desire, and other causes without number, that exchanges of property can easily be effected only by the common use of a variety of media of exchange each representing accurately the units of value as measured by the standard into which it can be converted on demand. Voluntary and universal exchange in coppers, nickels, silver, and gold, bank notes, greenbacks, and certificates mark the true test of a standard into which each can be converted with ease.

Law does not create this condition. It merely recognizes it and operates as a check against its disturbance. All efforts to effect by law a standard through any different principle than this have been futile, and the laws of trade and commerce, indifferent to statute law, have universally and consistently recognized as the standard that metal the intrinsic value of which has been most stable and most free from fluctuations. The immutable laws of trade, which control such condition, suffer no more by a statute than an effort to change the tides by royal edict.

HISTORY OF OUR MONEY STANDARD.

The first effort in this country toward establishing a monetary standard was in 1786, when the Congress of the Confederation chose as the unit of value the "Spanish milled dollar," containing 375.64 grains of pure silver. There was then no mint in the United States, and the "milled dollar" was never coined in America.

The first coinage law under the Republic was enacted April 2, 1792, and sought to establish a double standard of gold and silver at a ratio of 1 to 15. Whatever the result of the operation of the law, and the failure of the two metals to maintain the relative values fixed by statute, nevertheless it is quite clear that it was the intent and purpose of the lawmaking power to provide and legalize a double standard of value.

The subsequent act of June 28, 1834, changing the ratio from 1 to 15 to 1 to 16, by reducing the weight of the eagle from 270 grains to 258 grains, was in the hope of maintaining the double standard by regulating the ratio to conform to the commercial values of the metals.

Less than three years thereafter, by the act of January 18, 1837, which changed the ratio from 1 to 16 to 1 to 15.988 by again modifying the quantity of metal in the coins, the effort to maintain the double standard was apparent. The remarkable discovery of gold in California in 1847 and 1848 and in Australia in 1851 had a material influence upon the relative value of gold and silver, and the bullion in the silver coins of the United States increased in value beyond the value noted by their face. This condition bore fruit in the act of February 21, 1853, which provided for the reduction of the amount of metal in the silver half-dollar, quarter, and dime, and prohibited the further coinage of subsidiary silver coins, except upon Government account. The bullion value of a silver dollar prior to 1853, and, indeed, prior to 1873, was, the great proportion of the time, in excess of the face value, and comparatively few were coined.

The difference between the bullion and face value of silver coin accounted for their withdrawal from the channels of trade as a medium of exchange, and their conversion into commodities, regulated in value by the laws governing trade and commerce, irrespective of the statute making provision for their circulation as money at fixed valuations. The necessity for small change created the demand for the half-dollars, quarters, and dimes, which remained in circulation because the bullion was reduced and circulated at par because of the guaranty of the Government. By the provision of the law these subdivisions of the dollar were "paid out at the mint in exchange for gold coins at par," and there has never been a doubt but that their redemption would be equally at par. The struggle of the Government to maintain the double standard by law continued for nearly sixty years. The shifting of the ratio between the two metals was met by the change of statute.

The universal experience in business transactions marked the withdrawal from circulation of the undervalued coin. The debates in Congress just prior to the passage of the act of February 21, 1853, clearly mark the change of sentiment against the further effort to maintain a double standard. It was plainly claimed upon the floor of the House that in practice the gold standard was in force, and that it was the clear purpose of the Government to accept the single gold standard. While no statute was made to this end, the operations of the laws of trade gave recognition to this basis of values. No effort was made to change this sentiment, and for twenty years the question of coinage commanded but little attention by the American people. The struggle of the Government through the civil war crippled the credit of the Republic, and for a time specie payments were suspended and the Government degenerated to a paper basis.

The act of March 18, 1869, "to strengthen the public credit," pledged the Government to the payment of its demand notes and obligations in coin. This was the dawn of a new day in American finance and marked the resurrection of Government credit from the abyss into which it had fallen. The only coin in circulation at the time of the passage of the act of March 18, 1869, was gold. The subsequent provision for the redemption of the demand notes, and the universal policy of the Government to make redemption in the best coin known at the time of redemption, demonstrates beyond doubt that this pledge of the Government has been faithfully kept. It was but a short step, in principle as well as in time, to the provisions in the act of July 14, 1870, "to authorize the

refunding of the national debt," which made the bonds of that issue "redeemable in coin at the present standard of value."

The steps approaching the adoption of the gold standard became short and rapid. For five years prior to 1873 the question of legalizing the gold standard was under discussion in financial circles. As early as the winter of 1869 a bill was prepared in the Treasury Department containing provision for the discontinuance of the coinage of the silver dollar and the adoption of the gold dollar piece, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains, as the unit of value. This proposed measure was widely circulated among experts in finance, whose suggestions and criticisms were invited. On April 25, 1870, this bill, as S. 819, was introduced, and on December 19 following was favorably reported.

From the date of its preparation, in all of its forms, and throughout its discussions, covering several sessions, the provisions before mentioned remained intact. Not only that, but these two provisions were the only provisions relative to the standard of value and the silver dollar ever contained in the bill, either as it was originally drawn or throughout its entire consideration. The old standard silver dollar was never mentioned in the bill. The bill became a law February 12, 1873. For more than a quarter of a century preceding that date the commercial world had treated gold as the standard of measurement of values. The "act of 1873" was merely the policy and practice of our people crystallized into statute law. The change from the unwritten to the written law was simple and unattended by the slightest disturbance in trade.

If there had been no further legislation concerning the coinage of silver, there would exist to-day no single doubt of the money standard of the United States. The law of February 12, 1873, clearly adopts the gold one-dollar piece, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains of gold, as the unit of value. That statute has never been repealed nor directly amended, and by legal construction is in force to-day. Yet subsequent acts have so affected it that there is some doubt as to whether gold is fully recognized as our monetary standard. The act of February 28, 1878, authorizing the coinage of the standard silver dollar, and the act of July 14, 1890, directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, brought into circulation such a tremendous quantity of silver guaranteed by the Government to circulate at par that the burden of the Government was so increased as to make doubtful the strength and stability of the standard.

The fall in the price of silver gave courage to the advocates of cheap money, who sought, by restoring the silver dollar to circulation at less than its intrinsic value, to accomplish what they had failed to accomplish in their battle for cheap money at an earlier period. Public sentiment so suddenly changed upon this question that a free-coinage bill passed the House of Representatives on the 13th of December, 1876, by a vote of 167 to 53. Fortunately it was not acted upon by the Senate. A similar measure passed the House on November 3, 1877, by a vote of 163 to 34. Early in the year 1878 this bill was considered by the Senate and a compromise effected, resulting in the passage of the so-called "Bland-Allison act" on the 15th of February, 1878.

With all the ills which this measure brought upon the country, it was far to be preferred to an absolute free-coinage bill which threatened the country at that date.

President Hayes vetoed the bill, but on the 28th of February, 1878, it was passed over his veto by both Houses, the vote in the House being 196 to 73, and in the Senate 46 to 19. The rapidity with which the silver dollars were coined and issued into circulation greatly stimulated the advocates of cheap money, who became restless at the delay occasioned by the mints, which were not able to turn out the money as rapidly as the people desired, and the law of July 14, 1890, providing for the immediate issue of Treasury notes based upon the bullion purchased, to be redeemed by the dollars as coined, enabled the issue of the money more rapidly than was provided by the capacity of the mints.

By the act of September 26, 1890, Congress discontinued the coinage of the one-dollar gold piece, which the law of February 12, 1873, had declared to be the "unit of value." This act further confused the legal status of the standard. While the actual existence of the gold one-dollar piece is not essential, yet, it having been declared by law to be the "unit of value," its discontinuance cast doubt upon the character of the standard. The purchasing clause of the law of July 14, 1890, was repealed November 1, 1893. So grievous had grown the burden upon the Government because of the vast issue of a depreciated coin that confidence in the Government's ability to maintain it was shaken. The same law which repealed the purchasing clause of the act of July 14, 1890, contained the provision declaring it to be the fixed purpose of the Government to maintain its gold and silver "of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value."

But for this declaration the silver coins would have circulated only at their intrinsic value, which was less than par. With the declaration the pledge of the Government for the maintenance of

their parity with gold created an obligation as sacred as a national bond. By this pledge the Government made additional recognition of the standard of gold, in which, by implication, it proposed to measure the value of the silver dollar.

DOUBTS.

The tremendous increase of silver coin under the operation of the laws of 1878 and 1890 created a doubt as to the ability of the Government to maintain the parity of all of its money. Prior to 1873, when the gold standard was adopted, there had been issued by the Government only 8,031,238 silver dollars. From February 12, 1878, when the recoinage of the silver dollar was authorized, to November 1, 1893, when such coinage was discontinued, there were coined by the Government 482,357,376 silver dollars. Upon this last date there was not a silver dollar in circulation whose face value equaled its intrinsic value. The difference between the intrinsic and face value was a Government obligation, so established by Congressional act. No other method of maintenance of the parity of silver with gold other than the pledge of the Government was known to the law. The ability of the Government to bear this burden was never questioned. The mere money obligation imposed by the law created no serious embarrassment. It was the principle involved, coupled with the repeated efforts by a very considerable number of the people of the country to establish absolute free coinage of silver, which shook public confidence and produced the fear that a change of the monetary standard would result. Numerous propositions looking to such change were introduced in Congress, some of which were given such consideration as to keep the anxiety of the public at high pitch.

The passage of the so-called "Teller" resolution, February 28, 1898, by the United States Senate was hardly calculated to quiet these fears. In a period of less than twenty years two forcible efforts to establish absolute free coinage of silver were made and two laws enacted authorizing the coinage of the silver dollar, resulting in the issue of the vast sum of \$482,357,376, the same being the number of silver dollars coined from 1873 to 1893. With such dangers existing and with the energy of a great political party, with a vast number, though a minority, of our people clamoring for a change of standard, the necessity for a positive and unequivocal declaration by law seems absolute and paramount.

WISDOM OF IMMEDIATE ACTION.

If the legal standard to-day is the gold standard, under the act of 1873, a positive statute to that effect can do no harm. If, on the other hand, there is any reasonable doubt, it should be dispelled by a statute plain and clear in its terms and absolute in its effect. The American Government is too great for it to hesitate to make absolutely certain any of its policies, its responsibility to its people in the proper and peaceful discharge of their trade too sure and certain for it to suffer the slightest doubt of the standard of measurement of values in the vast business transactions of our people. The present conditions are most favorable and the time most opportune for the clear and unequivocal adoption of the gold standard.

Prior to the year 1896 the gold standard had been legally adopted by thirteen of the leading nations of the world, and since 1896 by four such nations, as evidenced by the following table:

Austria-Hungary	1893	Great Britain	1816
Brazil	1854	Japan	1897
Costa Rica	1896	Norway	1873
British Honduras	1894	Peru	1899
Chile	1895	Portugal	1854
Denmark	1873	Russia	1897
Egypt	1885	Sweden	1873
Finland	1877	Turkey	1882
Germany	1871		

Ten nations have suspended the coinage of silver on private account, thus effectually, although not absolutely, fixing their status as gold-standard countries. The names of such nations and the dates of their action are shown by the following table:

United States	1853, 1873, and 1878	Spain	1878
Belgium	1873	India	1893
France	1873	Switzerland	1874
Holland	1873	Greece	1875
Italy	1875	Venezuela	1892

Our adoption of the gold standard is in perfect accord with the movement in all of the leading nations of the world and in perfect harmony with the policy of our Government throughout its history. To dispel all lingering doubt from the mind of the public and to give clear expression to the nation's purpose relative to its monetary standard is the object of the legislation proposed by the bill under consideration. When the standard shall be permanently established and all doubt of its stability removed the parity of all our money will be fully recognized, and the kind of money in which payment shall be made will rarely, if ever, be the subject of dispute. When certainty shall take the place of doubt and the integrity of our credit be as fixed as the honor of the nation, the national debt can be readily refunded at lower interest rates and future loans negotiated with ease upon better terms than ever before.

The rapid development of American trade and its vast expan-

sion, bringing our people into close relations with the leading nations of the world, makes it imperative that the standard of value in which settlements are made shall be the best known to the highest civilization and shall safely appeal to intelligent and successful experience. Recent events, shaped by causes beyond our control, bearing obligations which national honor requires shall be courageously discharged, open new fields for American statesmanship. Channels of trade yet unknown to American enterprise and avenues of commerce yet to welcome American products will surely result. Such conditions emphasize the necessity for a standard of value which shall remain firm throughout the vicissitudes of competitive trade. Its permanence and stability should be above suspicion. Its security should be absolute.

Such are the general conditions of trade, as well as the condition of the National Treasury, that no disturbance whatever can possibly be caused by the legislation proposed. The volume and variety of our interstate and foreign trade has never before been equaled. The supply of labor fails to meet the demand for employment. Bountiful harvests and the output of manufactories strain the means of transportation. Vast enterprises for the extension of shipping facilities by land and sea are in progress. No clouds yet appear to cast a shadow upon our prosperity. The national revenues have been abundant and satisfactory, notwithstanding the expense incident to the war with Spain, which has been concluded with success and honor, nor the expense incurred by the insurrection in the Philippines. The taxes imposed by the Government to meet the increased expenditures are being patriotically borne by our people without a murmur.

The Government has been able to meet its obligations with ease and has declared its willingness to anticipate its interest payments so as to quickly return the money to the channels of trade, while at the same time it has reduced the national debt by the purchase of bonds before their maturity. The revenues exceed the expenditures, notwithstanding the extraordinary obligations. The Government is suffering no embarrassment whatever with her finances. The net gold in the Treasury on the 2d day of October, 1899, was \$254,328,820. There is more gold in the United States now than ever before. The world's product of gold in 1898 was the greatest in history and exceeded the product of 1897 by \$48,616,600 and of 1896 by \$35,177,600. The product of gold and silver since 1860 is shown by the accompanying table:

Product of gold and silver in the world since 1860.

[The annual production of 1860 to 1872 is obtained from 5-year period estimates, compiled by Dr. Adolph Soetbeer. Since 1872 the estimates are those of the Bureau of the Mint.]

Calendar year.	Gold.		Silver.		
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Commercial value.	Coining value.
1860	6,436,202	\$134,083,000	22,095,428	\$39,337,000	\$37,618,000
1861	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	46,191,000	45,772,000
1862	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,651,000	45,772,000
1863	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,616,000	45,772,000
1864	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,616,000	45,772,000
1865	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,308,000	45,772,000
1866	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,646,000	55,663,000
1867	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,173,000	55,663,000
1868	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,088,000	55,663,000
1869	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,043,000	55,663,000
1870	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,173,000	55,663,000
1871	5,591,014	115,577,000	63,317,014	83,598,000	81,884,000
1872	5,591,014	115,577,000	63,317,014	83,705,000	81,884,000
Total..	78,706,630	1,628,252,000	547,907,221	729,563,000	708,521,000
1873	4,653,675	96,200,000	63,267,187	82,120,800	81,800,000
1874	4,390,031	90,750,000	55,300,781	70,674,400	71,506,000
1875	4,716,563	97,500,000	62,281,719	77,578,100	80,500,000
1876	5,016,488	103,700,000	67,753,125	78,322,600	87,000,000
1877	5,612,106	113,947,200	62,679,916	75,278,600	81,040,700
1878	5,761,114	119,022,800	73,385,451	84,540,000	94,882,200
1879	5,203,174	108,778,800	74,383,495	83,532,700	96,172,600
1880	5,148,880	106,439,800	74,795,273	85,640,600	93,705,000
1881	4,983,742	103,023,100	79,020,872	89,925,700	102,168,400
1882	4,934,036	101,996,600	86,472,061	98,262,300	111,862,300
1883	4,614,588	95,392,000	89,175,023	98,984,399	115,207,000
1884	4,921,169	101,729,000	81,567,801	90,755,000	105,461,400
1885	5,245,872	108,435,600	91,609,959	97,518,800	118,445,200
1886	5,135,679	106,163,900	93,297,290	92,793,500	120,626,800
1887	5,116,861	105,774,900	96,123,586	94,051,000	124,281,000
1888	5,330,775	110,196,900	108,827,000	102,185,900	140,700,400
1889	5,973,790	123,489,200	120,213,611	112,414,100	155,427,700
1890	5,749,306	118,848,700	126,095,062	131,637,000	163,032,000
1891	6,320,194	130,650,000	137,170,919	135,500,200	177,352,300
1892	7,094,206	148,651,500	153,151,762	133,401,463	193,014,400
1893	7,618,811	157,491,800	165,472,621	129,119,900	213,914,400
1894	8,764,362	181,175,600	164,610,394	101,423,000	212,830,000
1895	9,615,190	198,763,600	167,590,960	105,545,600	216,561,900
1896	9,783,914	202,251,000	157,061,370	102,509,200	213,069,200
1897	11,552,532	238,812,000	164,073,172	93,443,800	212,134,800
1898	13,904,363	237,423,600	165,295,572	97,524,500	213,715,400
Total..	167,120,321	3,454,683,800	2,750,563,618	2,500,286,100	3,595,075,700
Grand total.	245,886,951	5,082,935,800	3,228,563,849	3,280,949,100	4,303,596,700

The product of gold from mines in the United States in 1898 was the greatest in the history of the world, exceeding the product of 1897 by \$7,100,000 and of 1896 by \$11,975,000. The product of gold and silver from mines in the United States since 1860 is shown by the following table:

Product of gold and silver from mines in the United States since 1860.

[The estimate for 1860-1872 is by R. W. Raymond, commissioner, and since 1872 by the Bureau of the Mint.]

Calendar year.	Gold.		Silver.		
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Commercial value.	Coining value.
1860.....	2,225,250	\$46,000,000	118,015	\$157,000	\$150,000
1861.....	2,080,125	43,000,000	1,546,875	2,032,000	2,000,000
1862.....	1,896,300	39,200,000	3,480,469	4,685,000	4,500,000
1863.....	1,935,000	40,000,000	6,574,219	8,842,000	8,500,000
1864.....	2,230,088	46,100,000	8,507,812	11,443,000	11,000,000
1865.....	2,576,759	53,225,000	8,701,171	11,642,000	11,250,000
1866.....	2,598,063	53,500,000	7,734,375	10,354,000	10,000,000
1867.....	2,502,197	51,725,000	10,441,408	13,886,000	13,500,000
1868.....	2,322,000	48,000,000	9,281,250	12,807,000	12,000,000
1869.....	2,394,563	49,500,000	9,251,250	12,296,000	12,000,000
1870.....	2,418,750	50,000,000	12,375,000	16,734,000	16,000,000
1871.....	2,104,313	43,500,000	17,789,062	23,578,000	23,000,000
1872.....	1,741,500	36,000,000	22,236,328	29,396,000	28,750,000
Total.....	29,012,908	599,750,000	118,065,232	157,366,000	152,650,000
1873.....	1,741,500	36,000,000	27,650,000	35,890,000	35,750,000
1874.....	1,620,563	33,500,000	28,848,000	38,880,000	37,300,000
1875.....	1,615,725	33,400,000	24,518,000	30,549,000	31,700,000
1876.....	1,930,162	39,000,000	30,009,000	34,600,000	33,800,000
1877.....	2,268,788	46,900,000	30,783,000	38,970,000	39,800,000
1878.....	2,476,800	51,200,000	34,960,000	40,270,000	45,200,000
1879.....	1,851,787	38,900,000	31,550,000	35,430,000	40,800,000
1880.....	1,741,500	36,000,000	30,320,000	34,720,000	39,200,000
1881.....	1,678,612	34,700,000	33,260,000	37,550,000	43,000,000
1882.....	1,572,187	32,500,000	39,200,000	41,120,000	46,800,000
1883.....	1,451,250	30,000,000	35,730,000	39,660,000	46,200,000
1884.....	1,489,950	30,800,000	37,300,000	42,070,000	48,800,000
1885.....	1,538,325	31,800,000	39,910,000	42,500,000	51,600,000
1886.....	1,606,125	35,000,000	39,440,000	39,230,000	51,000,000
1887.....	1,596,375	33,000,000	41,280,000	40,410,000	53,350,000
1888.....	1,604,841	33,175,000	45,780,000	43,020,000	59,195,000
1889.....	1,587,000	32,800,000	50,000,000	46,750,000	64,646,000
1890.....	1,588,880	32,845,000	54,500,000	57,225,000	70,465,000
1891.....	1,604,840	33,175,000	58,330,000	57,630,000	75,417,000
1892.....	1,590,375	33,000,000	63,500,000	55,563,000	82,101,000
1893.....	1,739,323	35,955,000	60,000,000	46,800,000	77,576,000
1894.....	1,910,813	39,500,000	49,500,000	31,422,000	64,000,000
1895.....	2,254,760	46,610,000	55,727,000	36,445,000	72,051,000
1896.....	2,568,132	53,088,000	58,835,000	39,655,000	76,009,000
1897.....	2,774,935	57,363,000	53,890,000	32,318,000	69,637,000
1898.....	3,118,398	64,463,000	54,438,000	32,118,000	70,384,000
Total.....	48,644,946	1,005,574,000	1,106,709,000	1,047,172,000	1,490,841,000
Grand total.....	77,657,854	1,605,324,000	1,222,774,232	1,204,538,000	1,583,491,000

The output of silver, as shown by the above tables, has varied in different years, while the product of gold has steadily increased annually since 1890. Notwithstanding the fluctuations in the product of silver, its value per ounce has had a uniform tendency downward, declining to 59 cents per ounce in 1898, its lowest register, as shown by the following table:

Highest, lowest, and average price of bar silver in London, per ounce British standard (0.925), since 1833, and the equivalent in United States gold coin of an ounce 1,000 fine, taken at the average price.

Calendar year.	Lowest quotation.	Highest quotation.	Average quotation.	Value of a fine ounce at average quotation.
1833.....	58½	59½	59½	\$1.297
1834.....	59½	60½	59½	1.313
1835.....	59½	60	59½	1.308
1836.....	59½	60½	60	1.315
1837.....	59	60½	59½	1.305
1838.....	59½	60½	59½	1.304
1839.....	60	60½	60½	1.323
1840.....	60½	60½	60½	1.323
1841.....	59½	60½	60½	1.316
1842.....	59½	60	59½	1.303
1843.....	59	59½	59½	1.297
1844.....	59½	59½	59½	1.304
1845.....	58½	59½	59½	1.298
1846.....	59	60½	59½	1.300
1847.....	58½	60½	59½	1.308
1848.....	58½	60	59½	1.304
1849.....	59½	60	59½	1.309
1850.....	59½	61½	61½	1.316
1851.....	60	61½	61	1.337
1852.....	59½	61½	60½	1.323
1853.....	60½	61½	61½	1.348
1854.....	60½	61½	61½	1.348
1855.....	60	61½	61½	1.344
1856.....	60½	62½	61½	1.344
1857.....	61	62½	61½	1.353
1858.....	60½	61½	61½	1.344
1859.....	61½	62½	62½	1.360
1860.....	61½	62½	61½	1.352

Highest, lowest, and average price of bar silver in London, etc.—Cont'd.

Calendar year.	Lowest quotation.	Highest quotation.	Average quotation.	Value of a fine ounce at average quotation.
1861.....	60½	61½	60½	\$1.333
1862.....	61	62½	61½	1.346
1863.....	61	61½	61½	1.345
1864.....	60½	62½	61½	1.345
1865.....	60½	61½	61½	1.338
1866.....	60½	62½	61½	1.339
1867.....	60½	61½	60½	1.328
1868.....	60½	61½	60½	1.326
1869.....	60	61	60½	1.325
1870.....	60½	60½	60½	1.328
1871.....	60½	61	60½	1.326
1872.....	59½	61½	60½	1.322
1873.....	57½	59½	59½	1.29789
1874.....	57½	59½	58½	1.27883
1875.....	55½	57½	56½	1.24233
1876.....	46½	58½	52½	1.16414
1877.....	53½	58½	54½	1.20189
1878.....	49½	55½	52½	1.15358
1879.....	48½	53½	51½	1.12392
1880.....	51½	52½	52½	1.14507
1881.....	50½	52½	51½	1.13229
1882.....	50	52½	51½	1.13502
1883.....	50	51½	50½	1.10874
1884.....	49½	51½	50½	1.11068
1885.....	46½	50	48½	1.06510
1886.....	42	47	45½	.99467
1887.....	47½	44½	44½	.97946
1888.....	41½	44½	42½	.93974
1889.....	42	44½	41½	.93511
1890.....	43½	54½	47½	1.04634
1891.....	43½	48½	45½	.98800
1892.....	37½	43½	39½	.87145
1893.....	30½	38½	35½	.78030
1894.....	27	31½	28½	.63479
1895.....	27½	31½	29½	.65406
1896.....	29½	31½	30½	.67565
1897.....	23½	29½	26½	.60483
1898.....	25	28½	26½	.59010

If, under all these conditions, the United States shall clearly by law adopt the gold standard, it will experience even less friction than resulted from the resumption of specie payment. The Government is most fortunate in being able to act in such an important matter under such favorable circumstances.

MAINTENANCE OF THE STANDARD.

But the gold standard is not to be adopted by a mere definition of the unit of value. Its full, complete, and harmonious operation must be provided for. The definition of the unit of value should be followed by a provision for the full payment of Government obligations in the standard. The recognition of the standard is reflected in the method pursued by the Government in the payment of its obligations. Mere statutory declaration would be idle unless the conduct of the nation toward its own debts were consistent with the statute. Law and conduct both must be free from ambiguity. National honor and national credit are closely allied. In the discharge of its debts the Government has always followed the practice of making payment in money equivalent to the best money known at the time. Gold has been the money received by the Government when our credit has been pledged, and the discharge of such debts in money of less value would be repudiation.

This provision will create no change in the practice which the Government has universally observed. Where the custom has so long prevailed to pay out gold for the greenback and Treasury note, as well as for the interest-bearing obligations, the plain provision by statute, in perfect harmony with such custom, will strengthen the credit of the Government, without effecting the slightest change in the national policy. The creation of a division of the Treasury where this practice may be operative, separate from the fiscal transactions of the Government, is in perfect accord with good business principles. It provides a place where, figuratively and practically, the "counter" of the Government may be found, with an officer ready and fully authorized to discharge all of the duties devolving upon the Government for the issue and redemption of its obligations. Such division of the Treasury will hold, in addition to the funds specifically dedicated to the payment of outstanding certificates, an amount of gold equal to 25 per cent of the amount both of United States notes and Treasury notes outstanding as a reserve fund to meet any demand for the redemption of greenbacks and Treasury notes when presented.

There is now no specific law authorizing any particular sum to be held as a reserve to meet the redemption of the greenbacks, unless it is contained in the provision of the law relating to the issue of gold certificates, directing that no more gold certificates shall be issued whenever the gold in the Treasury falls below \$100,000,000. Such practice should be legalized and based upon a specific statute. A reserve fund of one-fourth of such notes outstanding is deemed sufficient to guard against any sudden demand

of holders for the redemption of these obligations. Especially is it thought that such sum is sufficient in view of the provision wherein it is stipulated that all notes and certificates, when redeemed or exchanged, shall be held and not be withdrawn nor disbursed, except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged, save only when transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury from one fund to another.

The different funds which would, by this section, be referred to such division of the Treasury, together with the respective amounts, on the 30th day of September, 1899, are as follows:

1. Gold coin and bullion, represented by outstanding gold certificates	\$135,501,119
2. United States notes, represented by outstanding currency certificates	16,100,000
3. Silver dollars, represented by outstanding silver certificates	405,197,504
4. Silver bullion, represented by outstanding Treasury notes	91,167,280
5. Gold coin and bullion, equal to one-fourth of the United States notes (\$346,681,016) and Treasury notes (\$91,167,280) outstanding	109,462,074

The first four items enumerate the special deposits dedicated to specific payments. As these obligations are met, the deposits are correspondingly reduced.

In the absence of a law providing protection to the gold reserve, it is always subject to an encroachment in expenditures to meet the general expenses of the Government. Whenever such encroachment seems probable, a fear has arisen that the Government may not be able to meet its demand obligations, and a run upon the reserve for the redemption of the demand notes has followed. This situation is responsible for the so-called "endless chain." By separating the reserve fund from the general fund and prohibiting its use, except for redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes, the dangers to which it has been so greatly subjected will be removed. These demand notes are being redeemed in gold now and always have been, and no additional burden is imposed upon the Government. It is sought to simplify and legalize the practice, and create a division in the Treasury where the whole business of issuing and redeeming notes may be transacted, and to establish complete confidence in the redemption of our demand obligations.

INTERCHANGEABILITY.

If the absolute and unquestioned parity of all our money shall be truly and honestly maintained, proper provision for their interchangeability should be made. The provision for the interchangeability of the money of the Government has greatly frightened some people. The thought that any of our money might be taken to the counter of the Government and, upon presentation, be exchanged for gold coin has developed in many honest minds a serious doubt of the ability of the Government to discharge such function. But how else is this full parity to be maintained? In what other manner is it possible to measure the value of money, except by its comparison with, or measurement by, the standard of value? No difficulty arises when a silver certificate is presented to the Government in exchange for silver dollars, or of a gold certificate for gold dollars, or of a currency certificate for greenbacks.

But these are mere certificates of deposit, or warehouse receipts, if you please, for actual property or commodity which is specifically on deposit at the National Treasury, especially and solely dedicated to the payment of the certificates outstanding, for the payment of which they are pledged. No trouble has existed in ordinary times for the exchange of a greenback for gold, and it was only because of the reissue of the greenback, creating a so-called "endless chain," that the Government was at all embarrassed in the redemption of its demand obligations. The provision of the bill under consideration whereby such notes when once redeemed shall remain undisturbed in the Treasury, except by transfer from one fund to another under the direction of the Secretary, and reissued only in exchange for the same coin for which such exchange or redemption was made, will forever put an end to such difficulty. It is only in the case of the silver dollar that any doubt arises when the subject of interchangeability is advanced.

This only emphasizes the claim before made, that the issue of the vast number of silver dollars has been the cause of the embarrassment to the Government relative to its monetary standard. But the fact exists most plainly that these dollars are in actual circulation, and are based on the obligation of the Government, no matter whether that obligation be in the form of a statutory pledge or resting for final redemption upon the gold standard of value; nevertheless, it still remains that their absolute parity with gold has been assured, and the obligation must be met. In my judgment, it is best to meet it squarely, fairly, plainly. The intrinsic value of the silver dollar is less than its face. There is a certain proportion of the silver dollar which is based entirely upon the Government pledge. There is a certain

proportion which is equaled by its intrinsic value. The two can not be separated.

A part of the dollar can not be redeemed by the Government and a part unredeemed because it rests upon its intrinsic value. The only sensible and scientific way to make absolute provision for the parity is by providing that it shall be interchangeable with gold. I take it that few would object to this method but for the fear that a greater amount of silver dollars might be presented at one time than there was gold sufficient to meet the demand for exchange. But there are two things which will operate to overcome that fear. The first is that the legalizing of the gold standard and provision for the equality of all forms of money at a parity with the standard will so remove all doubt of the soundness and integrity of our money that there will be little occasion for the exchange of one kind of money for another.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. In reference to the silver dollars, when they are taken to the Treasury and are redeemed in gold, what is to become of them after they have been received by the Treasury? Are they to be paid out again or not?

Mr. OVERSTREET. There are two alternatives. The first is, they may be returned to trade upon the presentation of gold for their exchange, or they may be transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury from the redemption fund to the fiscal fund and used in the discharge of the Government expenses.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Then if they are paid out in due course of trade and transferred to this fund that the gentleman speaks of, do they not then become an endless chain in themselves, the same as you say the greenbacks and Treasury notes do?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No, sir; for the following reason—

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman answer that? If they are paid out in the due course of trade, can they not be taken back and gold demanded, and then go the round again for another endless chain, like the one the gentleman has talked of in reference to greenbacks and Treasury notes? I would like the gentleman to make that clear.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am perfectly willing to answer the gentleman's question. I may say that I think I have answered it very conclusively in the argument that I have prepared, but in order to deal with entire fairness with the gentleman I will answer his question now. Under the present law an endless chain is created because the greenback is reissued immediately and may again seek its way to the Treasury for a second redemption. That is stopped by the proposition which I have just elaborated in my argument. Under the proposed law the silver dollar, if exchanged for gold, would be returned to trade upon presentation of gold for another exchange of the silver; or it may be returned from one fund, the redemption fund, to another, the fiscal fund, by the Secretary of the Treasury. Just at that point is to be found the reason why an endless chain of silver dollars can not occur. It is the Secretary of the Treasury who has that option and right to transfer the silver dollar and pay it out, and it only goes out in the payment of the expenses of the Government.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Then will the gentleman yield for one other question? I do not mean to interrupt the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Then, if I understand, under this act the option is left absolutely with the Secretary whether he will keep them to be redeemed in gold or whether he transfers them to a fund that can go into the channels of trade and be paid out by the Government. Is that what you mean?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I understand the gentleman.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Is that what you mean? Is that the option?

Mr. OVERSTREET. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think that the part of my argument to which I am just about to direct my attention answers his question; and if it does not, when I am through I am perfectly willing to yield to him.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I do not mean captiously to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I understand, and I would willingly yield further if I did not think the gentleman's question was answered in the portion of my speech which is next to come.

Mr. SHAFROTH. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Secretary of the Treasury exercises the option given him under this bill to keep the silver dollars and not to turn them into the general fund of the Government, will it not produce a contraction of the currency to the extent of \$482,000,000?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Absolutely not, for the reason that the silver dollars can not be taken to the Treasury for exchange unless an equal amount of gold goes at once into circulation to take their place in trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. You mean to say that if there is no quantity of gold in the Treasury that they can not be redeemed. Is that your answer?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Well, that is an impossible query, for the reason that gold must be kept in the Treasury.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is it not a fact that when gold is drawn from the Treasury it is drawn for export, and that consequently when the silver dollar is presented to the Treasury and the gold is withdrawn that that money instead of remaining in circulation in this country goes to foreign countries? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. That happens under Democratic administrations. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] When the revenues of the Government do not equal expenses and trade becomes paralyzed and business at a standstill, then gold is exported; but under the beneficent influences of this measure and of the policy advocated by the Republican party, which presents it, that condition may and will never arise. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think I want to answer the first queries that were propounded, which I feel will be answered by the portion of my argument which I have now reached.

The demand for such exchange will be reduced in proportion as the certainty of the exchange is made manifest. [Applause on the Republican side.] There will be nothing to gain by the exchange.

If the silver dollar shall be made by law interchangeable with the gold dollar, if it can be used wherever the gold can be used, no benefit will accrue from such exchange. If the silver dollar is as good as gold, is not the holder entitled to the gold if offered in exchange? If the gold is no better than the silver dollar, can the fact be more completely demonstrated than by full exchange?

Furthermore, under the provisions of the proposed measure the large silver certificates will be broken up and reissued into certificates of denominations of one, two, and five dollars, thus bringing the silver circulation to the use of the small daily transactions of the people, which is commonly known as the pocket trade. Such provision will result in the scattering of the silver circulation, either in the dollar or the certificates, through so broad a territory and in the field of such constant demand that it will be exceedingly impracticable to gather together at one time any considerable amount for purposes solely of exchange at the Government counter. A few bills of large denomination, aggregating a very considerable sum, may be readily obtained, and their presentation for redemption or interchangeability would be embarrassing, but it is exceedingly difficult and expensive to gather and transport as many as a million silver dollar pieces, and equally troublesome to withdraw from the channels of daily trade any considerable sum of certificates of denominations of one, two, and five dollars. By this provision not only will the parity of the silver dollar be absolutely assured, but a place honorable and creditable for the use of the silver circulation will be effected.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman if under this bill all forms of currency, including greenbacks, Treasury notes, silver certificates, and silver dollars, are not a charge upon the gold fund which may be exchanged by the Secretary of the Treasury for gold?

Mr. OVERSTREET. They are, and always have been. They are on the gold fund now.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. No, sir.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The policy has not been changed on the part of the Government, and the proposition of this bill only crystallizes into law that practice which the Government has followed throughout the history of the country for half a century.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will ask you if every single dollar of the circulation excepting gold is not, under this bill, made a part of this endless chain which may be used to extract gold from the Treasury?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Not at all.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If it is not a charge upon the gold, how do you remove this from being a part of the endless chain? Have you not charged all the time during the last four years that you had no other object except this endless chain that you wanted to break up? Did you ever hear of any other argument in favor of the establishment of the gold standard except that it was to break up this endless chain that you speak of?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am perfectly frank to state that the policy that the Republican party has advocated since 1896 only demonstrated the adaptability of that standard to the breaking of the endless chain.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. And you propose to break it by making it apply to silver dollars as well as to greenbacks?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The proposition of this measure is to break the endless chain in the greenback redemption and prohibits the reissue except in exchange for the same coin in which it is redeemed, and the only exception is that to which I have referred.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Then you propose to aid the breaking of the endless chain by adding to the denominations of currency that are to be made a charge upon gold?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I expect the gentleman will be heard in the argument on his side, and which I fancy his brain is now working on. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. When was it that the Government first redeemed silver certificates in gold, or have they done so at any time?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The Government never has redeemed silver dollars in gold, and this bill does not provide for the redemption of silver dollars in gold. Every silver dollar ever issued by this Government has been based upon a declaration by Congressional act to maintain its parity and interchangeability with gold. I refer the gentleman to the law of November 1, 1893, which contained a provision that the silver dollar should be maintained at a parity and interchangeable value with gold. We make no provision for final redemption at all, but for the purposes of establishing beyond controversy and without evasion the parity which we have by numerous acts pledged ourselves to maintain we say that that parity is best maintained by the absolute interchangeability of the moneys.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I do not captiously desire to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I know. We propose to have the bills of larger denominations withdrawn and smaller ones issued in their place, so that they may be more readily obtained. [Applause.]

There have been coined into silver dollars the total sum of \$490,388,614. Experience has shown that a greater number of silver dollars have been coined than the people care to accept. They fail to be absorbed by general trade, and are largely used as a pledge for the issue of silver certificates, which are preferred.

Of the total silver coinage there were, on September 30, 1899, in silver certificates \$405,197,504 and in silver dollars \$85,191,110 in circulation.

Of this number there were on that date held by the Treasury \$5,023,283 silver dollars, leaving upon that date in actual circulation only \$80,167,825 of silver dollars.

Mr. GAINES. How many certificates?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Four hundred and five millions.

By the withdrawal from circulation of all one, two, and five dollars of greenbacks and Treasury notes, reissuing the same into larger denominations, and the reissue of the silver certificates of large denominations into one, two, and five dollar certificates, it would not only make a creditable and honorable place for the use of silver, but would at the same time make provision for a larger number of small notes, which the growing business of the country has greatly demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to complete his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Indiana may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. And that the time be charged to that side—that is, the difference in the time be charged to that side.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I have no kind of objection to the gentleman's time being extended. He is to be followed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], and I would like to have it understood that the same courtesy be extended to him.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Whatever time I consume on this side is chargeable to our division of the time.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Precisely; and if the gentleman from Georgia occupied an hour and any gentleman in the House should object, although his time is chargeable to this side, his speech would terminate. Therefore I desire to couple with the request that the gentleman from Indiana be allowed to complete his remarks that the gentleman from Georgia shall also be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. OVERSTREET. With the understanding that whatever time he consumes shall be charged to that side.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is perfectly understood.

There was no objection.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I speak of the use of silver certificates rather than the use of the silver dollars for the reason that experience has shown that the people do not care to accept the silver dollar in large numbers in circulation.

Mr. GAINES. Is it not a fact that the people also prefer gold certificates to the gold, just as they prefer the silver certificates to the silver coin?

Mr. OVERSTREET. It has not been so demonstrated, because the issue of gold certificates has been limited, and under the law can not be issued except when the gold reserve is above a fixed amount. And I will say, further, that all forms of paper money have a popular sentiment among the people, and when things are in normal condition and when these certificates are reduced below \$10 they will have a hold on the trade of the people, and it will be so held in circulation in everyday transactions that it will be nearly impossible for any considerable amount of silver certificates to be presented at one time for exchange.

The Government has repeatedly made effort at vast expense to force the silver dollar into circulation by paying express charges for transportation of the same from the mints into the channels of trade, but without apparently making much impression upon the public mind, which greatly prefers the certificates representing the silver dollars. The efforts of the Government for the past fourteen years in this respect are set forth in the following table:

Shipments of silver coin from the Treasury offices and mints during each fiscal year from 1886, and charges thereon for transportation.

Fiscal year.	Standard dollars.	Fractional coin.	Total.	Charges.	Rate per thousand.
1886.....			\$33,561,037.57	\$67,820.99	\$2.02
1887.....			35,196,902.84	62,353.39	1.77
1888.....	\$28,953,654.18	\$3,033,053.75	38,986,707.93	70,057.63	1.89
1889.....	26,427,496.71	8,331,777.97	34,759,274.68	69,309.34	1.99
1890.....	27,283,457.90	9,405,227.50	36,688,685.40	73,045.73	1.99
1891.....	29,299,237.20	11,598,692.10	40,897,929.30	77,257.62	1.89
1892.....	24,614,586.95	14,270,479.51	38,885,066.46	76,178.69	1.96
1893.....	27,098,582.65	11,957,903.90	39,056,486.55	71,990.77	1.84
1894.....	24,516,980.50	9,281,407.08	33,798,387.58	67,086.44	1.98
1895.....	27,155,466.80	11,885,117.47	39,040,584.27	78,333.84	2.01
1896.....	28,412,300.35	12,458,107.03	40,870,407.38	78,755.54	1.93
1897.....	29,600,035.10	12,029,955.29	41,629,990.39	81,526.24	1.96
1898.....	33,270,610.00	15,330,205.24	48,600,815.24	110,065.53	2.26
1899.....	33,305,262.00	17,018,536.65	50,323,798.65	111,741.61	2.22

Of the total amount of silver coined by the Government to September 30, 1899, viz, \$490,388,614, there were in silver dollar pieces \$85,191,110 and in silver certificates in one, two, and five dollars, \$175,064,553, leaving the sum of \$230,132,951 to be given and used in the pocket trade of the people if the larger denominations of silver certificates should be reissued in denominations of one, two, and five dollars, as shown by the following table:

Silver dollar pieces (September 30, 1899).....	\$85,191,110
One-dollar notes other than silver certificates.....	13,320,824
Two-dollar notes other than silver certificates.....	11,100,752
Five-dollar notes other than silver certificates.....	186,144,552
Silver certificates of \$1, \$2, and \$5.....	175,064,553
Total under \$5.....	470,830,791
National-bank notes of \$1, \$2, and \$5.....	75,990,505
	394,840,286
Total silver dollars coined (September 30, 1899).....	490,388,614
Silver dollar pieces.....	\$85,191,110
Silver certificates in \$1, \$2, and \$5.....	175,064,553
	260,255,663
Remaining to be given a use.....	230,132,951
Held by the Treasury (September 30, 1899):	
Silver dollar pieces.....	5,023,285
Silver certificates.....	4,610,821
	9,634,106
Net to be kept in circulation.....	220,498,845

There can be little question but the two provisions before mentioned, of making the silver actually interchangeable with gold and scattering it through the medium of certificates into the daily transactions of the business of the people, will very largely, if not completely, avoid any possible danger of their presentation in any considerable amounts at the Government counter for exchange.

SUBSIDIARY COINS.

The law enacted July 22, 1876, limits the issue of subsidiary coins to \$50,000,000. The growth of our business has developed such a demand for small change that, notwithstanding the limitation fixed by statute, subsidiary coins have so increased that on September 30, 1899, there was outstanding \$76,523,333.

This excess issue, certainly necessary, should be legalized, and further coinage of subsidiary coins left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. Owing to the great supply of silver bullion purchased under the law of July 14, 1890, it appears that such supply can be safely drawn upon for such coinage of subsidiary coins as shall be necessary for our trade, and a corresponding amount of Treasury notes canceled. The recoinage of worn and uncurrent coins is provided for only by the annual appropriation bills, and is sufficiently important to justify a permanent statute.

SILVER CERTIFICATES.

The proposed bill gives authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue or reissue United States notes or Treasury notes, in

denominations not less than \$1, as he may prescribe, and provides that all silver certificates hereafter issued or paid out shall be in denominations only of \$1, \$2, and \$5.

Two objects are sought by this: First, to empower the Secretary of the Treasury with discretion for the supply of small notes to meet the demands of the business world as the same shall arise. This necessity has been prominent of late on account of the vastly increased business of the country, requiring change in small transactions. Under the present law the Secretary of the Treasury does not possess this discretion, but is required to reissue such notes in the same denominations as redeemed, and the rigid enforcement of the law greatly embarrasses general business where such demand for small notes exists. While provision is made for the issue of United States notes and Treasury notes of such denominations, not less than \$1, as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, yet it is presumed that such discretion will be exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury only for the purpose of meeting an urgent demand for small notes and that, in the absence of such emergency, silver certificates will largely comprise the note issue of the Government under \$10. Rather than operate as a restriction of the note issues under \$10, such provision will afford a relief by an increase of circulation of small notes.

The second object of this provision is to break up the large silver certificates. The breaking up of the large silver certificates will place upon silver, either in the dollar or in the certificates representing the silver dollars, a great proportion of the burden of daily business transactions, and thus so scatter the certificates that, even if an effort were made to embarrass the Treasury by their presentation for exchange, the difficulty of procuring them would very largely, if not completely, defeat such effort.

The total amount in silver certificates on September 30, 1899, was \$405,197,504, of which \$175,064,553 was in denominations under \$10. The total number of silver dollars coined up to September 30, 1899, was \$490,388,614, so that on that day there were outstanding \$5,191,110 silver dollars. Of this last sum there was held by the Treasury, unrepresented by certificates, \$5,023,285, leaving but \$80,167,825 actually in circulation. If the field of daily business transactions, or the "pocket trade," shall be given over to silver, it would be quickly absorbed and, once distributed, would become the permanent medium of exchange in small transactions among our people. It could fill no greater nor more honorable use.

The total amount of our money on September 30, 1899, in denominations under \$10 (except the fractional currency, subsidiary coin, and gold dollars) was \$470,830,791, divided as follows:

Silver dollars, unrepresented by silver certificates.....	\$85,191,110
Silver certificates.....	175,064,553
Greenbacks.....	82,289,173
Treasury notes of 1890.....	52,295,450
National-bank notes.....	75,990,505

The breaking up of the silver certificates over \$5 would increase the money in denominations under \$10 by \$230,132,951. But the discretionary power given the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the issue of greenbacks and Treasury notes in denominations under \$10 renders possible the withdrawal from circulation of such denominations of the greenback and Treasury note aggregating \$134,584,623 and their reissue in larger denominations. Hence the minimum of increase of small notes would be the difference between the total amount of silver certificates over \$5, or \$230,132,951, and the aggregate of the greenbacks and Treasury notes under \$10, or \$134,584,623 which is \$95,548,328. If the national-bank notes under \$10 should be converted into larger denominations, the minimum increase of small notes would be but \$19,557,823, an insufficient increase of small notes, and hence the denominations of the bank notes remain undisturbed by the bill.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman from Indiana allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I prefer, Mr. Chairman, not to yield at the present time, because I am trespassing on the indulgence of the committee now.

Mr. COX. Very well.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The demand for money of small denominations has been most urgent, and it is believed that the cash transactions of the people will give employment to the increase here provided without increasing the strain upon the Treasury.

BANKS.

The proposed measure makes no change in the general banking laws. Indeed, a studied effort has been made to effect a complete guaranty of the quality and parity of our money without any disturbance in the quantity or kind. But, without changing in any form the circulation or kinds of money, three propositions are made concerning banks, which seek rather to correct recognized defects than to in any way make original propositions.

BANK-NOTE CIRCULATION.

The proposition to allow national banks to issue circulation to the par value of the bonds deposited for their security is neither new nor partisan. It has been recommended by four Presidents

and five Secretaries of the Treasury, and bills containing such provision have been introduced in Congress and supported by members of both political parties. It is entirely consistent with the present banking system. The same reasons which justify the issue of 90 per cent of the bonds will justify an issue to the par value of the bonds. The only objection advanced, aside from that of demagogic attack generally upon banks, is that it permits too large an increase of the volume of circulation and threatens an inflation.

But it is unfair to compare the amount possible under the proposed bill with the amount of bank notes now in circulation. The lack of profit upon bank-note circulation because of the tax has reduced such circulation far below the amount ever expected, and such reduction can be creditably charged to a contraction which was equally unexpected. The proper comparison is between the amount possible under the present law and the amount possible under the proposed amendment, which would be but a 10 per cent increase, an amount which can be easily absorbed by the business of the country and utilized in as many different money centers as there are national banks. The proposition is sound in logic, safe in practice, and more consistent with the system in vogue than the present law.

TAX UPON BANK FRANCHISES.

The repeal of the tax upon national bank notes and the substitution of a tax upon bank franchises as measured by their capital, surplus, and undivided profits, are proposed in a spirit of fairness and for a just distribution of the burden of the tax. Under the present law every national bank must deposit at least \$12,500 in bonds, being 25 per cent of the minimum of the capital stock (\$50,000) with which a national bank may be organized. Experience shows that the metropolitan banks issue the least circulation, many of them issuing none, depending upon the large deposits for their loanable capital. Very often these deposits are largely increased by country banks establishing reserve agencies. On the contrary, the small banks, forced to draw heavily upon their capital to make safe provision for their different reserve funds, are compelled to issue note circulation to insure a reasonable loanable fund, and suffer in the transaction by paying the circulation tax in greater degree, in proportion to their capital, than the larger and better-equipped city banks.

The per cent fixed for the tax, one-tenth of 1 per cent semiannually, will produce substantially the same revenue realized under the present law. The revenue received from the present tax during five years last past was \$9,469,948.39, while the proposed tax upon the same banks for the same period would have been \$9,778,858.12, the difference being, through a period of five years, only \$308,909.73. The beneficial results of this proposition will be that the larger banks will pay the tax in the same degree as the smaller banks, while the amount of revenue will be practically unchanged.

SMALL BANKS.

The proposed amendment authorizing the organization of banks with capital as low as \$25,000 in places containing no greater population than 2,000 is designed to meet the demand coming from the sparsely settled districts of the country and the small but growing towns for banking accommodations.

By authorizing the establishment of banks of small capital in small communities money will be held in the country districts where it can be used at the seasons of the year when it is most in demand. Not only will the supply be bettered, but interest rates will be made lower by reason of the change. Under the present law national banks can not be organized with less capital than \$50,000, and the consequence is that the amount required for the purchase of bonds and the reserve funds have operated against the establishment of national banks in small communities. The bill proposes to change this in the way named in the hope of creating money centers of small degree in various localities, where the convenience of the system will greatly aid in the movement of crops at seasons of the year when, under present methods, money for short-time loans is procured only with difficulty, attended with increased interest rates.

The advocates of currency reform firmly declare that the financial operations of the Government are upon the gold standard, but that the honest fears engendered by doubtful legislation relative to silver coinage and the persistent attack upon the standard of value fully justify the legislation asked. To firmly fix gold as the standard of value in unequivocal terms, made fully operative by all proper safeguards, is the central idea of the law proposed. It is confidently believed that the country demands it and that our action will be ratified by the people.

The supporters of the proposition are not confined to the Republican party, nor to the so-called "money centers." Democrats of courage and conviction have nobly dared to break from party lines and suffer, unflinchingly, the sting of the party whip in honest and patriotic effort to uphold the integrity of the national credit and make secure the foundation of the vast and expanding business of our people. The American people in the great agri-

cultural fields of the country are fully awake to the importance of the subject and appreciate the wisdom of the legislation. Nearly all of those who wavered in 1896 corrected their error in 1898.

While the question is economic and should be separated from partisan debate, yet the Republican party will not attempt escape from responsibility for the legislation, believing that it is wise for the country, safe for the people, and in perfect harmony with the institutions of the nation. Whatever attitude has been assumed by the Republican party toward silver coinage has been controlled by conditions which existed at the time and which seemed best for the interests of the country. Every possible effort was made to render full test toward fixing the relation of silver and grant the fullest opportunity to demonstrate the ability of the Government to provide the largest possible coinage of the metal without endangering the stability of the standard. This effort extended in good faith to conferences looking to international agreements, but without success. But when it became evident that the gold standard was endangered there was neither hesitation nor halting upon the part of the Republican party, which promptly and courageously declared for the maintenance of the existing gold standard. The year 1896 marked the limit of patient experiment. Since then the party has been pronounced in its position and is to-day united in its effort to firmly fix this standard without equivocation or evasion. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, certain tables, together with a statement in analysis of the bill.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I make no objection, providing leave is granted for a certain number of days, say ten days, for other members to print their remarks.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think there will be no trouble about that.

Mr. MADDOX. I think that will have to be done in the House, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CANNON). The gentleman is correct about it.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I shall be permitted to ask the gentleman from Indiana for his construction of section 2.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I have not the floor now, so that I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MADDOX) is recognized.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the members of this House that it was either my fortune or misfortune, I am not certain which, to be on the Banking and Currency Committee in the last House of Representatives. I heard a great deal of talk about the currency and about the single gold standard and various other things connected with banking. There were many bills presented to that committee for its consideration, and each individual presenting those bills thought, as a matter of course, that his was the proper one. But it is a matter of history that that committee failed to evolve any bill that met with the entire sanction of the Republican party on this floor at that time.

It is a part of the history of the country that the Fifty-fifth Congress, before its adjournment, appointed—that is, the Republican party in a Republican caucus appointed—a committee for the purpose of drafting a bill to present to this Congress, and the newspapers tell us that they met down on the seashore and various and divers other places and prepared this bill that is now presented to this House. So it will be seen that these gentlemen have had ever since the adjournment of the last Congress to consider this bill and to prepare themselves to defend it. And when this Congress convened they come in with a gag rule and call on us within two days from the time the bill is presented to answer their well-matured plan, which took them from nine to ten months to consummate, and then we are told that we are dealt fairly with on this side.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] undertook to justify the rule that is imposed on this side of the House by citing certain precedents in the Fifty-third Congress. But what were those precedents? The very questions that were determined there—in other words, the bills submitted to the House and supposed to be passed upon in the limit of time he mentions—had been discussed day after day in the Fifty-third Congress before that bill went to the Senate, and for two or three long months were discussed in the Senate; and yet they cite that as a precedent why the Democrats should be bound and gagged with this rule, and that, too, on a question of so vast importance as this bill presented to us to-day. I want to say to the members of this House that if I have analyzed this bill correctly, if I understand it, there is no measure that has been presented to the American Congress in the last half century that is fraught with so much that is dangerous to people of this country in remote sections, even to the great centers of this Republic. And then to think that

under these conditions we are absolutely gagged, as I might say, under the present rules that have been adopted by the majority of the House.

But I desire to call your attention to another fact before I proceed to discuss this bill. I read in the newspapers the other day that there was a banquet held over in New York at which our late leader on that side of the House—and a leader he was—Mr. Reed, of Maine, was present. He was invited to respond to the toast, I believe, "Finances of our country." Among other things he said, he undertook to analyze the late vote that was had in Ohio for governor, and he told those people present that there was nothing in that vote to encourage the Republican party that they had a cinch on the Government by any means, and that if they wanted the gold standard enacted into a law they had better be about it right away [laughter on the Democratic side]; that the Republicans had a majority of both Houses and the President. So I take it that the faithful sent the word abroad that it was necessary to do this thing at once if it was done at all.

So I presume that this is the excuse, Mr. Chairman, for this "rush" order for the legislation now before us. Now, it is a very singular fact that a country which is so prosperous as we have been led to believe that this country is at the present time by the message of the President of the United States should need such legislation as this. This condition of prosperity has been claimed by the President himself and by statesmen on the other side of the House. They claim that the gold standard is already existing. They claim that this is really the source of our present degree of prosperity. Why rush, then, into the House of Representatives a gag rule, so as to shut off the minority and force through a bill of this character which is now pending, when, according to your own statement and the statement of your own political friends, there is no necessity for it? Is there any special or peculiar reason why this legislation should be so hurried, as you now propose it shall be, other than that you are afraid of the people and propose to take Mr. Reed's advice?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose with these few preliminary remarks to get down to the facts, to consider the bill itself in all of its details, and I want to say now, in the beginning of my remarks, that I shall not discuss the advantages or the disadvantages of the gold standard, to which the gentleman from Indiana who has just taken his seat has devoted so much time. I shall leave that question for the consideration and analysis of some other gentlemen on this side of the Chamber. I propose to address myself briefly to the workings of the pending bill, if enacted into law, as I understand its operations; and I crave the attention of Representatives on this side of the House, and on that side as well, for, with all due respect to your ability and intelligence, I do not believe you gentlemen who have in caucus determined to support the bill understand all of the features embodied therein.

The first section of the bill provides for the single gold standard. The question has been discussed somewhat before, I believe, but has never been approved by or submitted for the approval of the people of the United States.

May I not stop here, Mr. Chairman, to say that in the last national convention—of 1896—that we had in this country the Republican party at St. Louis adopted a bimetallic platform, or a platform favoring the free coinage of silver under an international agreement?

May I not say that at Chicago the Democratic party adopted a similar provision, but without demanding the aid or interposition of any other nation? Over 12,000,000 people voted on these two propositions, and 300,000, I believe, or about that number, voted on the proposition of a single gold standard, and carried one little militia district in the United States!

Who is it that demands the single gold standard to-day? The gentleman from Indiana who has just taken his seat [Mr. OVERSTREET] says that long before silver was demonetized by the act of 1873 the monetary and commercial interests of the country discussed the subject. Now, the financial interests of the country have discussed this bill that is presented to us for our consideration to-day. The great body of the people of this country—those people who pay the taxes, who must meet the burdens, the expenditures of the country, these people who have fought for the flag of the country, and are expected to protect it—have not been consulted in regard thereto. [Applause on Democratic side.] And we are told, sir, by the gentleman who has just taken his seat that the gold standard exists to-day, and has been so recognized by this Administration. Now, if the gold standard exists to-day it exists by reason of the usurpation of a party, and without any authorization of any existing law of the land. [Applause on Democratic side.] But, as the gentleman from Indiana candidly admits, this first section has for its purpose to make that lawful which these officers of the Government have done without authority of law. But I propose to refer to this proposition a little later on—that is, to show what is the demand for the legislation now proposed.

The second section of the bill proposes to strike the word "coin" from every promise to pay and every obligation which has been made by the people of the United States. Every sort of liability which has been contracted by the Government of the United States in pursuance of law is to be ultimately redeemed in gold. The purpose of the present legislation is to apply to the bonded indebtedness of the people, which is payable in coin, the word "gold," to strike out the word "coin" and to amend all of these obligations by inserting in lieu thereof the word "gold." That is one of the propositions of the pending bill. That is the purpose of it. The word "coin" is to be stricken from every obligation that is given by the United States and "gold" inserted in lieu thereof. For what purpose? Why, Mr. Chairman, the purpose is obvious. The purpose is to change the contract which was made with the people of the United States, with the holders of these obligations, thereby making those bonds more valuable and enriching the already rich at the expense of the people. The purpose is to make the gold standard the basis on which all of the contracts and obligations of the Government shall be based. I apprehend that no gentleman will stand on this floor and sincerely suggest a doubt as to the purpose of the pending legislation.

Now, what are we to do? In the first place, we must remember that the proposition here is to strike from every contract of indebtedness, that the toiling masses of this country will have to pay ultimately, the word "coin" and insert in lieu thereof the word "gold." Who has consulted the great mass of the American people in order to find out whether such a proposition as that does or does not meet their approbation?

Where did you get the authority? Did you get it from the great toiling millions who pay the taxes of the country? I think you have been consulting the financial circles again on that subject, and that you are doing their bidding only.

The third section of the bill authorizes the establishment of a division of the Treasury to carry out this scheme. Now, you understand, gentlemen, there is a new division to be established in the Treasury for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this bill. In other words, one great banking institution is to be established by the United States to serve the purpose of the national banks of this country, to furnish them security for their banking ventures, and where they may at will speculate on the money of final redemption placed there by the toil of the people. That is what it means, no more and no less. This section further provides that—

There shall be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury of the United States, and taken up on the books of said division as a redemption fund, the amount of gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890.

All these are to be transferred to this new division in the Treasury. It will be observed that the silver bullion and silver dollars held for redemption of the Treasury notes issued under the act of 1890 are to be impounded completely and retired from circulation, for they are now to be redeemed in gold, and that—

an amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount, both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding.

Now, you understand by this proposition, gentlemen, that in this new division, while all this bullion and specie and these United States notes that are held for the purpose of redeeming outstanding certificates that have been issued upon this bullion and gold and silver and United States notes are to be transferred to this division, here is a provision that 25 per cent of gold shall be transferred to this new division for a reserve fund; that is, 25 per cent of all outstanding Treasury certificates issued under the act of 1890 and the currency known as United States notes and more commonly known as greenbacks.

Now, I have a report here which will show exactly how much outstanding money of this character we have, and all you have to do is to find 25 per cent of these Treasury notes and of the greenbacks outstanding, and you will find how much gold we must keep up in this new division of the Treasury along with this vast sum of money that is to be transferred to that division.

Mr. COX. Will my colleague allow me just there for one moment?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Let us get this point out clearly, so that we will understand it. Now, there is 25 per cent to be transferred into this new bureau there, as a kind of redemption fund.

Mr. MADDOX. Yes.

Mr. COX. Now, has your mind been called to the point, Where do they get that 25 per cent from?

Mr. MADDOX. Where do they get it from?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. MADDOX. I am going to explain that to you. They have a scheme to get it mighty easy.

Mr. COX. I understand that they are going to get it by issuing bonds.

Mr. MADDOX. Oh, I understand. There is no trouble about getting it.

Now, in addition to that, this bill provides that in transferring from one division to what they call the general fund we must keep—and that is something that we must at all times keep in view—we must keep not less than \$50,000,000 in the other end of the Treasury. Now, add that sum to the 25 per cent of these outstanding notes, with this other vast sum of money, and you will find what it is that they propose to impound in the Treasury of the United States and to hold there.

The bill requires that all gold and gold bullion held against outstanding certificates of the United States, notes held against outstanding currency certificates, all the silver dollars held against outstanding certificates, the amount held in silver dollars and silver bullion against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of 1890, 25 per cent in gold of all outstanding United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890, and not less than \$50,000,000 of the general fund are to be held in the Treasury at all times. That is in the third section.

Now I want to call your attention to section 4 of this bill. That section proceeds to turn over to the Secretary of the Treasury the earth and the fullness thereof. He is directed to maintain the gold reserve at all hazards. He may issue and sell bonds whenever in his judgment it is necessary to maintain the reserve fund, payable in gold, and without limit, so that the interest does not exceed 3 per cent, and that they are made payable in gold. Now, gentlemen, in this connection I want to call your attention to the act under which these gentlemen have been selling United States bonds and bringing gold into the Treasury, and then let you compare this act with the one that they propose to enact now. Now, listen:

On and after the 1st day of January, 1879, the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem in coin the United States legal-tender notes then outstanding on their presentation for redemption at the office of the assistant treasurer of the United States in the city of New York, in sums of not less than \$50; and to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for the redemption in this act authorized or required, he is authorized to use any surplus revenue from time to time in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to issue, sell, and dispose of at not less than par in coin either of the description of bonds of the United States described in the act of Congress approved July 14, 1870.

Now, gentlemen, that is the law under which the bonds of the people have been sold in order to keep up what they call a gold reserve in the Treasury of the United States.

Notwithstanding we had millions of dollars of coin, as defined by the statutes of this country, in the Treasury at this time for the redemption of outstanding obligations, they assumed to say that under and by virtue of this provision of law the Secretary of the Treasury shall have authority to issue the people's bonds, or the people's promises to pay, and to buy gold, when every debt that was then outstanding was redeemable in coin, and according to the law of the land silver was coin, and there was an abundance of coin and bullion to have met every obligation.

When I hear gentlemen on that side of the House discussing the existing gold standard, as they call it, I am reminded that under a statute in Georgia if a man can hold a piece of property in peaceable and adverse possession for twenty years it gives him a perfect title; but there is never a minute during that time that that fellow is not uneasy for fear some other fellow is going to take the land away from him by virtue of a title; and that is exactly the proposition here. You want to get this bill enacted into law and, by your usurped authority in depreciating silver, establish what you call the existing gold standard before the people can have the opportunity to place a party in power that respects the law and will compel you to disgorge your unauthorized and illegal possessions, gained under what you call an existing gold standard that never existed except by arbitrary power exercised by the Treasury.

Now, gentlemen, is there any law or any interpretation that can be given to this section by which the President of the United States is authorized to go out and barter the bonds of the people for gold when he has got coin in the Treasury that will meet the demands under the laws of the country and pay the indebtedness according to the contract? Besides, it is only meant to redeem United States notes, commonly known as greenbacks.

Now, this law proposes to issue gold bonds at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury; and I say there is no limit upon his power, except that they shall be made payable in gold and that they shall not bear more than 3 per cent interest. Now, I think I will be able a little later on to show you why this power is unlimited. The facilities in this bill for raiding the Treasury of the United States have never been equalled on earth and never will be again, I think.

Section 5: This section provides that the United States notes, commonly known as greenbacks and Treasury notes, issued under the act of 1890, presented for redemption, shall be redeemed in gold now at the will of the holders, and that the silver certificates shall be redeemed in accordance with the existing law.

Now, gentlemen, in order to understand this scheme that they

have now you must understand the law as it exists to-day. These Treasury notes and these greenback notes to-day, under the laws of the United States, are redeemable in coin, silver, and gold, as the Stanley Matthew's resolution provides, and when they are redeemed they are to be reissued and put in circulation again.

What is the effect of this bill? The meaning of this bill, if enacted into law, is that these certificates, greenbacks, and Treasury notes—these greenbacks, when they are paid in, have to remain impounded in the Treasury of the United States until you present gold to take them out. Under the laws to-day—that is to say, if the laws of this country were obeyed—they could be redeemed in silver and gold alike, and when once redeemed they could be reissued again and sent forth to the country to increase the circulation. So that you see in this measure they propose not only to make them payable in gold, but it is a scheme to decrease the circulation. It decreases the circulation exactly to the amount of gold that to the extent and amount of certificates that are in existence, because when you present the greenbacks for redemption you draw from the Treasury the gold and these greenbacks remain impounded. There is no way for them to be returned to circulation until you take gold back and buy them out again. Under the existing law they are required to be reissued, and they would go out to pay the expenses of the Government and enter into circulation again. This bill, if enacted into law, will forbid that.

Under this law every greenback, every Treasury note, and every silver dollar issued is to be exchangeable for gold, only, so far as silver is concerned, the silver dollar is to be exchanged with the holder of the certificate when the silver dollar is on a parity with gold. Now, that is what it means. If the silver dollar, when you carry silver certificates to the Treasury for redemption, is at a parity with gold, you are expected to accept a silver dollar for your silver certificate. Why had not they just as well say eggs or any other old thing, if on a parity with gold. Now, that is the purpose of this bill, so far as the silver certificate is concerned, and, gentlemen, if this bill is enacted into law, mark you, that I prophesy to-day that within less than five years every silver dollar except the subsidiary coin will be confiscated and practically sent to the junk shop. They have provided easy ways for it in this measure.

My honest opinion is that, upon reading this bill, if your party on that side of the House had been sincere they would have ordered the silver to the block and sold it for gold, thus realizing as much out of the wreck you propose as possible for the people. What is the use to have a silver dollar in the Treasury at all that you say costs 50 cents, when a little piece of paper that probably will not cost one-hundredth part of a cent answers the same purpose? Why do you want to trouble the people to take that piece of paper to the Treasury and get a silver dollar for it and then take that silver dollar and draw a gold dollar on it? But gentlemen say they do not propose to redeem the silver in gold. Gentlemen, it does not matter what they propose; it does not matter what construction you put upon this law; when you turn it over to the parties that are to be benefited by it you will find what construction will be placed upon it.

I say to-day if it is possible for the United States Treasury to construe the law as it has done in order to depreciate the silver dollar, as it has done, it is possible to construe a law to mean almost anything. Now, they say in this bill that silver is not to be disturbed, its legal-tender quality is still to be maintained, but just along a little bit further you will find a masked battery under the polite word of "exchange." And when these national banks get hold of that battery they will turn it upon the Treasurer of the United States, exchange every silver dollar in it for one of gold, if the Secretary of the Treasury has to mortgage this country to its full value to raise the gold to accomplish this purpose, and they will disparage this money to such an extent that it will be practically worthless in a few years.

It will be seen that our whole financial structure is based on the gold in the Treasury, and the gold in the Treasury had, and to be had, depends on the ability of the Treasurer to exchange the promises of the people to pay in gold with interest produced by the labor of the toiling millions of this country. In other words, if these notes are redeemed in gold—and who would expect anything else when gold is the standard—you must carry that same kind of coin back to get your greenbacks or your Treasury notes from the Treasury.

Now, it would seem from a casual reading of the bill that, if silver certificates are presented for redemption, they are to be redeemed in silver, but as a matter of fact they are to be redeemed in gold, or "exchanged," to use their polite term.

Section 8 provides that section 5159 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be repealed, and that section 8 of this bill shall be substituted therefor. Now, the section, gentlemen, to be repealed—and I call your especial attention to this—reads this way:

SEC. 5159. Every association, after having complied with the provisions of this title, preliminary to the commencement of the banking business, and

before it shall be authorized to commence banking business under this title, shall transfer and deliver to the Treasurer of the United States any United States registered bonds, bearing interest, to an amount not less than \$30,000 and not less than one-third of the capital stock paid in. Such bonds shall be received by the Treasurer upon deposit, and shall be by him safely kept in his office, until they shall be otherwise disposed of, in pursuance of the provisions of this title.

That means, gentlemen, that before any man or any association can commence banking business in this country they must at least purchase \$30,000 of the registered bonds of the United States before they can begin business. It further says not less than one-third of the capital stock paid in. Now, let me draw this illustration for you—this is a law that exists to-day—and then I will talk about the amendment. Suppose a man has a bank with a capital stock paid in of a million dollars. He is required to purchase three hundred and thirty-three and one-third thousand dollars of bonds.

Mr. BROSIUS. No; only two hundred and fifty thousand.

Mr. MADDUX. I am talking about the law as it now stands. They have got to purchase three hundred and thirty-three and one-third thousand dollars registered bonds of the United States before they can proceed to business. Now, this law, if I understand it, only requires the national bank, the million-dollar bank, to purchase \$50,000 of registered bonds before beginning business; those that are of \$150,000 or less shall purchase one-quarter of the capital stock paid in of registered bonds of the United States. Now, gentlemen, if I am correct, the bill further provides the method by which these gentlemen can withdraw their bonds from the United States Treasury that they have deposited before. For instance, a bank has purchased \$333,000 of bonds and issued certificates on that amount, which money is in circulation to-day. This new bill provides that these gentlemen can call in their circulating medium down to the extent of \$50,000 and go to the Treasury and turn it over to the Treasurer and withdraw the bonds they have deposited heretofore, by that means contracting the currency of the country at will. That is what it means.

I want to call your attention to the fact that while every method is offered here in this bill for contracting the currency, there is no way by which the currency can be increased except upon the authority granted the national banks, who will have the right to issue the certificates to the limit of the bonds they take out. It is left entirely to the discretion of the banks. They throw that sop to us and tell us in towns of less than 2,000 inhabitants they will allow the organization of banks with \$25,000 capital, and we are supposed to be content with that.

But you will remember, gentlemen, that they do not propose in this bill anywhere to compel these bankers to issue the certificates to the full amount of the bonds they take out, or to the full amount of bonds they are authorized to take out. That is left entirely discretionary with them, but they may withdraw their circulation altogether if they want to; they need not issue a dollar if they do not want to. They make provisions by which the currency issued by the Government may be impounded and withdrawn from circulation, and the only means of increasing the circulation in the bill is left to the option of the national bankers. If they withdrew their circulation and produced a panic in 1893, when there was no law by which the national currency could be impounded, what will they do when our whole finances are turned over to them? It is to their interest to make money scarce and as high as possible. Our experience with them in 1893-94, that as soon as the panic which they had inaugurated for political purposes got beyond their control they closed their doors and proved their incapacity to meet the situation. Are we to learn nothing by experience?

Now, what is the difficulty in the pending bill? As I say, you have a method in its construction. You have in every way provided against the increase in circulation. You have every door barred to an increase in the circulation in the country. The whole business tends not to increase the circulation of the money of the people of the country, but the operation of the whole proposition is to put the people absolutely in the hands of the national banks.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will the gentleman allow an interruption just there?

Mr. MADDUX. I would prefer to proceed in my own time without interruption.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman a single question. Whether it is not a fact that that identical statement that he has just made, and which he also made a few moments ago, that the bill tended to contract the currency of the country, was not made in the last Presidential campaign by almost every silver speaker on the platforms in every part of the United States?

Mr. MADDUX. I will state to the gentleman frankly that I never heard it or suggested it myself.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Did you not contend that if we went to a gold standard it would contract the currency because of the diminishing product of gold? Did you not make that statement through your party organs and platform speakers?

Mr. MADDUX. I do not know that such statement was made to my personal knowledge.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. It was so stated.

Mr. MADDUX. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed—
Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH (continuing). It was stated in the last campaign, and it was made an argument by some stump speakers, but, as a matter of fact, in place of being an accurate statement, the circulating medium has increased largely throughout the country.

Mr. MADDUX. So you say.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do say it, and can prove it.

Mr. TERRY. Does the gentleman from Michigan forget the fact that the output of gold is nearly doubled?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Does the gentleman from Georgia deny that the circulation has increased?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What kind of circulation?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Gold, silver, and paper money.

Mr. MADDUX. Mr. Chairman, I object to a speech being inserted in the body of my remarks. The gentleman will have ample time in his own right to make any suggestions he pleases to make upon this subject.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I only asked the gentleman to state "yes or no." But he denies that the circulation has increased.

Mr. MADDUX. I am perfectly willing to take the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. I will not deny his statement. He so states in his report.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. You want to familiarize yourself with the subject before you undertake to make a speech on the money question.

Mr. MADDUX. Perhaps I am informed, if the gentleman will wait.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. You do not seem to be.

Mr. MADDUX. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to proceed in my own way without interruption.

Section 8 provides for a change in section 5159 of the Revised Statutes by amending it so as to read: "That every association, after having complied with the provisions of this title, preliminary to the commencement of the banking business, and before it shall be authorized to commence the banking business, under this title shall transfer and deliver to the Treasurer of the United States as security for its circulating notes any United States registered bonds, bearing interest, to an amount, where the capital is \$150,000 or less, not less than one-fourth of the capital, and \$50,000 where the capital is in excess of \$150,000."

This section also provides that such bond shall be received by the Treasurer upon deposit, and goes on further to provide that banks having on deposit bonds in excess of that amount are authorized to reduce their circulation by the deposit of lawful money as provided by law. The section also provides that the amount of such notes issued by any national banking association shall not exceed in any case the par value of the bonds deposited as herein provided. That is to say, that any association which enters into the business of banking may exercise its own volition in the matter and does not need to issue a dollar of circulation unless they desire to do so, or they can, on the other hand, issue circulation to the full extent of the par value of the bonds purchased by them. The law says they shall not exceed that amount in circulation, but shall be confined to the amount of the bonds purchased, leaving it entirely within their discretion to enlarge or to contract the currency, as they may see fit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just asked me a question about the circulation or about the contraction of the currency has suggested that we contended for that in the last Democratic canvass. Now I propose to call the attention of the House to something that your side contended for in that same canvass. You did not contend for the single gold standard then.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman from Georgia challenges the issue in my Congressional district, I will state to him that he is entirely mistaken, for that was actually the issue made there.

Mr. MADDUX. I am challenging the position of your party upon this section.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman challenges the statement I have made, I will state now plainly that we made the issue in that campaign in my district broadly upon that question.

Mr. MADDUX. Well, it was against your platform, and I am going to prove it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is in the House. I call the attention of all the members on this side who heard it to the fact that a few days ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in discussing the rule under which we are now acting, said that the Republican party would have to turn aside from nothing it advocated in 1896 in advocating this bill. I propose to challenge that statement and to bring witnesses to show that they will have to do so. Now, as I have already stated, in the great conventions that were held by the two parties in 1896 and in the contests that were fought out in this country the questions upon which those contests hinged were bimetallicism by international agreement with the Republican party and bimetallicism without the intervention of any other country with the Democratic party.

How well do I remember that in the last days of the Fifty-fourth Congress, just after the great campaign in 1896, a bill was sent into this House from the other body for the purpose of appointing a high commission to go to Europe to bring about international bimetalism, as the Republicans had pledged in their platform in 1896, in St. Louis. When that bill was reported to this House favorably from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Charles W. Stone], the proposition was attacked in this House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Quigg], who said that your party was committed to the gold standard. He took issue with it. He attempted to defeat it, and in that he was joined by Mr. Johnson of Indiana, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Knox], by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Henry], and, I think, by my friend from Connecticut [Mr. Hill] also.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of that side and of this side of the House to what these great Republican leaders said their pledges to the people were in 1896. I want to show you by what authority they come here to-day and propose to enact the gold standard and to fix it upon this country, and I want to show you what the proposition was that put them in office. I propose to show by the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Grosvenor] in this House that over 100 members owed their election to the Fifty-fifth Congress to the advocacy of the bimetallic standard by your party in 1896. I propose to show by that late lamented, great, and distinguished man, Mr. Dingley, of Maine, that it was a party pledge that you made and one that ought to be honestly carried out. I shall show by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hepburn] that the man who advocates anything to the contrary is an apostate from his party. Yet you come here to-day and tell the country that you are justified and authorized in establishing the gold standard for this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When I have shown that, I propose to show to you and to the country upon the highest evidence why it is that our commission in Europe failed to accomplish international bimetalism because of the intermeddling of the Cabinet officers of the present Administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BENTON. And the President as well.

Mr. MADDOX. And that you have not in good faith endeavored to carry out the pledges and the plans that you promised the people you would in 1896.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose to introduce the witnesses. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read these extracts, unless some other gentleman will read them for me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read them if the gentleman desires.

Mr. MADDOX. Now, gentlemen, I call your attention to these utterances of the distinguished leaders on that side of the House. This is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-fourth Congress, just after the campaign of 1896, when these questions were fresh in the minds of these statesmen who addressed this House at that time. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to allow the gentleman from New York [Mr. Quigg] to interpret the Republican platform for me. [Applause.] I do not understand that document as he has attempted to interpret it here, and I do not believe that the Republicans of the United States understood it as he attempts to give it interpretation. I find in that platform, Mr. Speaker, a pledge that the Republican party would use all honorable exertions to labor to secure the very international agreement that is looked to in this bill. It must be remembered that the Republican party does not change its views every year, and that the Republican platform of 1896 is but a continuation of the platform of 1892. There is no material difference between them. Every declaration that you find in one you find clearly stated in the other, or find to be a fair and just implication from that which is stated.

In 1892 we expressly commended the efforts that were then being made by a Republican Administration in the direction of an international conference. When we made the declaration that we did make in the platform, that we would use all honest efforts to secure international agreement, every man understood that that was in continuation of the policy of the last Republican Administration, and through this very means of an international conference. That, I say, was the understanding of everyone. I want to disclaim again, Mr. Speaker, the right of the gentleman from New York to interpret the platform to mean that we pledged ourselves irrevocably to a gold standard and against the free coinage of silver. Our declaration ought not to be so construed by anyone. Here it is:

"The Republican party is unreservedly for sound money. It caused the enactment of the law providing for the resumption of specie payment."

"Specie payment," observe—not gold. It plumes itself upon that fact. "Since then every dollar has been as good as gold. We are unalterably opposed to every measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of our country. We are therefore opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement."

"Except by international agreement." "Except" is the emphatic word. There is a pledge that we are in favor of the free coinage of silver through an international agreement. No man can escape that language. The platform goes on—

"except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved."

Do you find in that language an irrevocable pledge for all time to the gold standard? The pledge is that "until" we can secure this international agreement "which we pledge ourselves to promote," we will maintain the existing gold standard.

Mr. Speaker, with the views that I have of this platform, I could not utter

the sentiments the gentleman from New York has uttered without regarding myself as an apostate from Republicanism and as recreant to the pledge. [Applause.]

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Dingley. [Applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the six minutes which have been allotted to me I can only briefly suggest two reasons why I shall support the pending bill. First, it is in response to the clear, distinct, unequivocal pledge of the Republican party in the last campaign. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, sometimes resolutions are adopted in national conventions hastily and inconsiderately that have no binding force, but everyone who is acquainted with the circumstances under which the St. Louis convention was held understands that this feature of the platform was a clear, distinct, and well-considered declaration of the Republican party. [Applause.]

[Extract from Mr. GROSVENOR.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, important declarations in political platforms are never the result of accident, but are always the result of design. They are always born of conditions existing in the constituents of the party that gives the utterance. The Republican convention at St. Louis was a representative body of a great party in the country, and the men who went there and represented their several constituencies understood the conditions at home. They did not go to St. Louis to declare a platitude nor to make a mere declaration that was not demanded by existing conditions and that was not in consonance with the opinions of their constituents. The Republican party at the threshold of the campaign was met by the question of what should constitute its financial plank, and looking to what the party had done and what it had already pledged itself to do, it found that it had put into the statute book of the United States the declaration that the country pledged itself to the maintenance of the parity between gold and silver on November 1, 1893, when a Republican Congress, by the almost solid vote of its party in both Houses, repealed the Sherman purchasing clause and enacted the following:

"That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value."

That was the law of the United States of America when the St. Louis convention assembled and the platform was adopted, and yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. Quigg] comes here and tells us that the Republican party is under no obligations in regard to the parity of this coinage, but is a single gold standard party. The compromises of the St. Louis convention produced the result that we have before us, and I want to read a single paragraph from the proceedings of that convention, which will show what the understanding of the representatives there present was when this plank was brought in.

Mr. HARDY. And the gentleman from New York was a delegate to that convention.

Mr. QUIGG. Yes, I was, and voted for the platform and shall construe it in the Fifty-fifth Congress.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It does not need any construction. We did not need any construction of it during the campaign.

I was saying that more than 100 men who will ornament the next House of Representatives on the Republican side owe their election to that platform and an honest espousal of it before the masses of the people. [Applause.]

Now, what have we here? The Republican party on this floor is called upon to act to-day. This bill is here for action, not repudiation. This bill came from the gathered wisdom of its friends at the other end of the Capitol; it came in obedience to the voice of the Republican party. True, a great many men got on board of the Republican ship during last summer. Are we to turn from our own proposition because Democrats voted with us? Quite the reverse. When we saw them drowning in the water we gathered them up and took them ashore, and we have planted them on the rock of honest money and good government, and the Republican party owes nothing more to the men who have joined it for principle. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent to put certain of the paragraphs that I imperfectly read into my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDOX. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the evidence there from the lips of these gentlemen shows conclusively that when Mr. Quigg and these other gentlemen would commit your party irrevocably to the gold standard, they refused to let them do so in the most emphatic terms, and declared that a hundred men upon that side of the House owed their seats to the advocacy of bimetalism in your platform. And I take it—I think I may legitimately do so—that had they advocated a different policy the President of the United States would not occupy the chair that he occupies to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I desire to call your attention to statements attributed by the newspapers to the President:

President McKinley, in a speech at Toledo, Ohio, on February 12, 1891, clearly expressed the operation of the theory of the demonetization of silver in the following language:

"During all of Grover Cleveland's years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored even before his inauguration to office to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards and to the end of his Administration persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and to demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce, and therefore dear. He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else—money the master, everything else the servant. He was not thinking of 'the poor' then. He had left 'their side.' He was not standing forth in their defense. Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money! The sponsor and promoter of these professing to stand guard over the welfare of the poor and lowly! Was there ever more inconsistency or reckless assumption!"

This question naturally arises, Who authorizes these gentlemen to bring this bill before Congress to fasten the gold standard upon the country? You will find that they will rise upon that side of the House and attempt to explain to you that they have tried to bring about international bimetalism. They made the attempt to do so, but the question is, Have they honestly made that attempt? I propose to let one of their own party men, a Senator in the United States Senate, and one of the high commissioners

sent to Europe to bring about that result, answer that question for himself. Now I call your attention to a portion of Mr. WOLCOTT'S speech:

Here, Mr. President, I should naturally end this account of our negotiations, negotiations which are still pending and undetermined. The extraordinary statements, however, lately made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and which, unexplained, must seriously affect the future of any further attempts toward securing international action, require some reference at this time.

When Congress convened on the 6th of last month, the President, in his references to the subject of international bimetalism, spoke earnestly and anxiously of his desire to see an international bimetallic agreement consummated. His assurances gave renewed hope to bimetalists all over the country, and seemed final and conclusive answer to those who had claimed that the President was not in earnest in his efforts toward international bimetalism. For myself, I needed no such proof. I had again and again been made to know how genuine was the President's devotion to this settlement of the vexed question. Within a fortnight after this, with no event meanwhile which would change existing conditions, the Secretary of the Treasury, in support of a bill which he has prepared respecting the currency, said as follows to a committee of Congress:

"The objects I have in mind in the series of provisions offered by me are four in number:

"1. To commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard, remove, so far as possible, all doubts and fears on that point, and thus strengthen the credit of the United States both at home and abroad."

The two statements are utterly at variance and contradictory to each other. They can not be reconciled. This is not the proper occasion to analyze the bill of the Secretary. It will reach limbo long before it reaches the Senate. He proposes to capitalize the premium on our bonds sold recently and to make them, with others to be issued, a security definitely payable in gold.

The Secretary forgets that only a few months ago, when the country was in dire distress, we were compelled to pay \$9,000,000 for the privilege of keeping the word "gold" out of some of these very bonds. He ought not to forget, for the bank of which he was president, it was said, got some of the bonds and received some of the proceeds of that deplorable transaction. But I do not intend to discuss the bill which the President's message specifically does not indorse, and it is premature to criticize the Secretary's Republicanism, for his advent into the party and the Cabinet were practically contemporaneous. We must accept the situation.

In my opinion, the great majority of the members of the Republican party are bimetalists, and the fact that they are misrepresented by a Cabinet officer is not pleasing, but it is endurable. The selection of the members of his official household is the President's own affair, and so long as he stands upon the question of bimetalism where he has ever stood, there is no serious ground for apprehension. But even in the inconceivable event that the Chief Magistrate of this people should, in the exercise of his judgment, determine to countenance the final fastening upon this country of the burdens of the gold standard, I trust we may still warrant for faith and hope in the pledges of the party and the wisdom of its counsels.

We will cross our bridges when we come to them. The time when this country will submit to the final imposition of gold monometallism is far away. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the ability of this country to maintain alone the parity between silver and gold, there is no question that the concurrence of other nations would help and not hinder the cause of bimetalism in the United States, and efforts to secure it ought to receive the cordial support of every citizen who is opposed to gold monometallism.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. Is it not a fact that during the extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress the President sent in a message here on the currency question, calling for the creation of a home monetary commission to more firmly fix the gold standard on this country, and at the same time Senator WOLCOTT was at work with the International Monetary Commission in Europe working for international bimetalism?

Mr. MADDOX. In Indianapolis?

Mr. GAINES. He wanted a commission to work in the United States to continue the gold standard, while at the same time the Wolcott commission was in Europe working for bimetalism or the double standard.

Mr. MADDOX. The fact is, and it can be proven, that when this commission was in Europe attempting to bring about bimetalism in accordance with the pledge of the Republican party to the people by which that Administration holds its possession today, that commission was being undermined by the Cabinet officers of this country and by other parties belonging to that party, and it is true, as the gentlemen from Tennessee suggest, that he did send such a message to Congress. And here, when you rise in this House, if you should, I undertake to say that gentlemen will claim that they attempted to bring about bimetalism, but I confront you with these facts. This gentleman who was on the commission says that bimetalism is not dead. I commend the reading of his speech to every one of you. He gives you the reason he failed, in no uncertain tones, and the present Administration is directly responsible for its failure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the committee to a couple of extracts of what is purported to have emanated from Mr. Lincoln. I have read them often:

If a government contracted a debt with a certain amount of money in circulation, and then contracted the money volume before the debt was paid, it is the most heinous crime that a government could commit against the people.

Now, gentlemen, if I am right in my theories in regard to this matter, when this five hundred millions, or nearly so, of silver is practically confiscated and sent into the junk shop, when the national-bank currency is withdrawn, the greenbacks and Treasury notes impounded, according to what Mr. Lincoln says, there can be nothing that is more heinous for a government to do than to break the contract in this way and under these circumstances.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. I will ask the gentleman if he refers to any message or authenticated paper of Mr. Lincoln?

Mr. MADDOX. It is a newspaper extract. I have seen it often before.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It does not make any difference; it is true.

Mr. MADDOX. As my colleague states, it does not make any difference who said it; it is true, all the same.

Now, Mr. Lincoln said something else. That is, he is reputed to have said:

I see in the near future a crisis arising which unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudice of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this time more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in times of war. God grant that my suspicion may prove groundless.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the gentleman from Georgia permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That quotation has been floating for a good many years, and was submitted to the biographers of Mr. Lincoln, who have control of his papers, and they have more than once publicly stated that it does not appear in Mr. Lincoln's papers and that it is not in his style; so that their idea is that Mr. Lincoln is free from the charge that he gave expression to such a sentiment.

Mr. MADDOX. He may not have said it, but it was a statement that would have done him or any other man credit, and the prophecy has been fulfilled. Nor could there be presented anything more conclusive as to the results of the power of these corporations than this bill demonstrates here to-day.

Mr. TERRY. You might say that it was never denied to be the utterance of Lincoln until lately.

Mr. MADDOX. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have analyzed this bill correctly, I think it is this in the concrete.

This bill is a scheme to legalize the authority that has been asserted by the Treasurer of the United States in attempting to put this country on a gold basis without the authority of law.

This bill is a scheme to take from the people one-half of its money of final redemption and confiscate the same.

This is a bill to change and alter the contracts of the people without their consent, for making their obligations which have heretofore, since the organization of the Government, been payable in coin, both gold and silver, payable in gold only.

This bill is a scheme to contract the currency at the will of the bankers.

This bill is a scheme to adopt the gold standard for the benefit of the banks, without making themselves liable in any way to furnish the gold to sustain it. This bill is a scheme for the advantage of about 300,000 people holding stock in national banks to the disadvantage of the rest of the people in the United States.

This bill, in my judgment, is a scheme by which and through which will be operated the most gigantic trust that ever cursed any nation or country.

I want to say now that this bill, as proposed, has been considered in financial circles, but has not been asked for by the great body of the people of this country. They have not been consulted about it. Thousands and thousands of people throughout the land who are to be the most affected by it know nothing of it; they have not been consulted in regard to it. In every State and county throughout the Republic there reside the great toiling millions who have to bear the burdens of this Government. They have no newspapers, no lobbies, no organizations, no associations to defend their interest. They are looking to-day to the patriotism, to the honor and integrity of the Representatives of this House to take care of their interest. I trust that they will not look in vain to the Representatives of the great party to which I belong. Let every Democrat vote no, thereby putting the seal of his condemnation on the most dangerous and baneful measure that has found its way into Congress in a half century. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I have been a member of this House I have not only been invited to speak, but urged to do so by those who are responsible for the steady flow of conversation on this side of the Chamber [laughter], and while that is a new sensation, I will admit that it is not an altogether disagreeable one, though, to tell the truth about it, I have not that appetite for discussing the silver question that I once had. I fear that we all share in that strange decline of interest which is observable throughout the country whenever men come together for the purpose of talk and controversy. I remember a time when if a man was seen upon a street corner in an attitude of debate, he would be surrounded within a few minutes by the whole voting population of the neighborhood and could be sure of an audience whether he hired a hall or not. But to-day if a man should be seen in that attitude upon the same corner, it would tend to greatly reduce the population of the town. [Laughter.]

This is not because these questions are less important than they were, but because the substance of them has taken final shape in the opinion of all the people. Complaint is made to-day that enough time has not been allowed to enable our Democratic friends to prepare for this debate. I have always had a suspicion that my friends on the Democratic side were never adequately prepared to discuss the gold and silver question, but never expected to hear from such distinguished sources as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] on last Friday and my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] to-day the candid admission that after years of speechmaking even the select men of the Democratic party feel that they require an additional period of incubation before they are ready to tackle the question in the Congress of the United States. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I do not pretend to be as well able to speak on the question as I used to be. There was a time when I carried in my head, or in my satchel, about all the figures that had any real application to the question; and one of the embarrassments of my unexpected participation in the debate to-day arises from the fact that I have left my figures at home and my documentary evidence at my boarding house. But after all, that does not trouble me as much as it might, because I guess the debate has reached a stage where a person has to choose between letting go of the statistics or losing his audience. [Laughter.] To-day nearly everybody feels a sufficient authority on this subject within himself to dispense with extracts either from old speeches or standard textbooks. One of the results of the national education through which we have passed was that everybody began to feel that he could make a speech on this subject himself, a frame of mind absolutely fatal to the authority of other people's speeches. But there is a more complete reason why the Democratic party does not feel as well able to discuss the silver question now as it was in that memorable year when the Federal Union was resolved into a general debating society.

Mr. Chairman, things have changed in the United States since the date of that great discussion. I hold in my hand a volume called *The First Battle* [laughter and applause], a volume which was printed about three years ago and sold by subscription for \$3.50. It sold well, I am informed, considering that neither the covers nor the contents were worth anything, netting to the author in the neighborhood of \$40,000. The volume seems to have been retired from circulation without any particular clamor for a reissue, for I had the greatest possible difficulty in securing a copy, finally being able to track one to a second-hand bookstore, where, without much negotiation, I corralled it for 25 cents. [Laughter.] That decline in the price of *The First Battle* is only an approximate measure of the decline in public interest and public confidence in the hearsays and flights of the imagination there collected together. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, I notice, Mr. Chairman, in reading this book, that a good many speeches that were actually made were left out, and only those preserved which deal with the more solid and enduring features of the doctrine the author was engaged in propagating. Most of the speeches had even then grown inconsequential and unavailable for the holiday trade that followed the election of 1896, and I shall only pick out a few which deal with the author's philosophy at its most important points. For example, I find here a speech, made in the little city of Newton, in Iowa, near the beginning of his first journey into the enemy's country. Supposing the town had been named after Sir Isaac, he thought a few remarks on the subject of gravitation would be in order. Thereupon he said:

Some of the laws of finance—I may say all the great laws of finance—are as certain in their operation and as irresistible in their force as the law of gravitation. If you throw a stone into the air you know that it will come down. Why? Because it is drawn toward the center of the earth. The law upon which we base our fight is as sure as the law of gravitation. If we have a gold standard, prices are as certain to fall as the stone which we throw into the air.

[Laughter.]

I expect that this solemn declaration of immutable principles would be received more seriously here if there were not so many persons present who recollect the author's first address on this subject on this floor in 1892. At that time he was devoting his energies to a Democratic scheme for reducing the price of everything by free trade with those countries which produce things cheaper than we do. And when he was confronted by the fact that the protective tariff had operated to secure the same beneficial results by the universal employment of our own people, he declared that things were not yet cheap enough, but that everybody was being robbed by the extortions of the protective tariff; and in so far as he admitted that the products of labor had declined in price he said:

You must attribute it to the inventive genius that has multiplied, a thousand times in many instances, the strength of a single arm and enables us to do with one man what fifty could not do fifty years ago. That is what has brought down prices in this country and everywhere.—*Congressional Record*, March 16, 1892.

In less than four years this versatile young man, the national success of his party having in the meantime still further reduced

prices by putting American industries into the soup house, turned about and proposed to help the case by doubling the price of every article of man's use and necessity in the United States. It would have been a strange satire on human credulity if the Democratic party had been able to win the election of 1892 by offering their services to bring prices down and then to win the election of 1896 by throwing Mr. Cleveland overboard and starting out on a new scheme with the object of putting prices up. When we come to look back at it, it was evidently too much to expect that the same community could be swindled twice by the same fellows within the space of four years. I therefore ask everybody to keep in mind for a few minutes this heartfelt tribute to Sir Isaac Newton to which I have referred.

I find here also a speech delivered in Minneapolis to a congregation of good women, and I am glad that Mr. Bryan had the courtesy to recognize the influence and interest of the women of the United States in politics. My own conviction is that the Republican party owes them a good deal more than the Populistic movement does, because a woman's mind is less likely to be dazzled by brilliant conclusions than a man's is. I have often said that the Republican party won in the great debate because at the American fireside, where the discussion was carried on in dead earnest, there was a debater who searched the mysteries of the question without being disturbed very much by the explosions of red fire and campaign spectacles. She demanded to know what the effect was to be on the household treasury of creating a new coin called a dollar out of material valued nowhere in the world at more than 50 cents.

Gentlemen on the other side say that the Republican party bought and intimidated the working people of the United States; that they were corrupted and coerced into voting the Republican ticket. They are mistaken. They were won over by a little woman at home, who counseled them to keep clear of a proposition which proposed to double the price of everything, at least until they had made written agreements to double their own wages and salaries; so that I think that Mr. Bryan was not only chivalrous but wise when he addressed to the women of Minneapolis by far the best speech he made during the campaign. Among other things he told these women:

The gold standard means dearer money; dearer money means cheaper property; cheaper property means harder times; harder times means more people out of work; more people out of work means more people destitute; more people destitute means more people desperate; more people desperate means more crime.

You see that in this hasty sketch he carried the women of Minneapolis by easy stages from the crime of '73 to the universal reign of crime incident to a continuance of the gold standard in the United States. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] The election returns of that town indicate that Mr. Bryan did not make a very deep impression upon the women of Minneapolis by this speech; they did not think very much of it, although I have no doubt they enjoyed the peach-ripening smiles that went with it. And it would be an interesting thing for Mr. Bryan to go back to Minneapolis and get that splendid congregation of women together once more, if only for the satisfaction of knowing what they think of him by this time.

Now, I can readily perceive how a man who has his system encumbered with a philosophy like that would naturally call for time if suddenly required now to express his views with reference to the gold standard as opposed to the free coinage of silver in the United States. I would be glad if you folks could have more time. My sympathies go out to my friends on the other side on account of the short shift allowed them for readjusting back-number ideas to the present-day condition of affairs. Yet, on the other hand, we have got to save a little sympathy for ourselves, and on the whole we will agree that while the matter is somewhat sudden in this House there is no particular suddenness so far as the country is concerned.

In every Congressional district the people have been discussing this matter with more or less diligence for a space of some years. There is not a line in this bill that has not been at least twice recommended by the President of the United States, and not a single thing in it that has not been at various times reported by committees of this House. What we do, therefore, we do in the light of day, each man acting for the people whose commission he bears.

Yet I find in the New York Herald of yesterday an interview with one ex-Governor Altgeld, of Chicago, and I name him because he is a type of the unscrupulous clamor that follows every debate on the money question in the United States. He says:

The policies of the Republican party have been determined by syndicates, and the men at Washington have simply carried out instructions. It is hard to conceive a more pitiable or contemptible sight than that of the Republican Representatives simply obeying orders.

I will say to ex-Governor Altgeld and to the disintegrating group of charlatans for which he speaks that the Republican party is here obeying orders. I am here obeying the orders of a vast majority of the people of the Tenth Congressional district of Iowa.

I come here as an humble Representative in this Chamber to enter the judgment of my constituents and to do what I can to put the laws of this country into harmony with their opinion. [Applause.]

This bill has had to bear the weight of no little criticism. There was a good deal of noise made about the ears of the last Congress because they did not then take action in the matter of currency legislation. Mass meetings were held all over the West, urging and even threatening representatives in Congress in connection with this matter. No account was taken of the fact that the Senate had not yet been delivered from the control of Populism, and this House was urged to spend its time in splashing in the water, without the reasonable expectation of seeing currency legislation carried beyond a vote in this Chamber. This precipitancy arose from the fact that a considerable number of men in the House and out of it, after great meditation, had perfected a certain system of finance in their own minds, and little toleration was extended by these to the difficulties which naturally grew up in respect to the passage of such legislation. There is an infirmity in the human mind which tends to consider knowledge as a monopoly, existing in the minds of experts, under a sort of copyright, and there seems to be something about the pursuit of the science of money especially which enables everybody to appreciate his own ideas without treating very hospitably the ideas of anybody else. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

To a man, therefore, bearing the burden of exclusive information like that even the rational delay arising from the fact that nothing could be finally done appeared like a reckless waste of time. There were criticisms also, though, I am bound to say, not in any spirit of hostility to this measure, because it does not present a more academic scheme of finance. I confess that I share in neither of these complaints. There was no sense in sending a bill like this to perish at the hands of an unfriendly Senate, and so far as the size of this measure is concerned it seems to me to be big enough for practical purposes. It covers all the ground upon which the verdict of the people has been taken; and while it is not an elaborate code of monetary reform, like some that were manufactured for us by accommodating gentlemen on the outside, and like others matured by studious and able men among our own number, it is none the less respectable on that account. While it is a little bill, it deals with great things, and in such a way that nobody is bewildered and nobody lost in the woods, except our brethren on the other side, who are now vainly trying to recall distant echoes of campaign cries that have grown ludicrous in the light of experience.

Venturing to speak only for myself, I think this bill comes to us at about the right time and about the right size, and I only wish that we might be able to present it as a Christmas gift to the business world of America. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The central and dominant purpose of the measure is to define the standard of value, to make known by law, without quibble, uncertainty, or evasion, exactly what the dollar of the United States is, what the word means, what is to be understood when the name of the standard coin is spoken. We propose to give to the American dollar a significance so free from doubt and ambiguity that the meaning of it shall be fixed and unquestionable throughout the commercial world. But it will be observed that in defining without equivocation the standard of value this bill does not ignore the historical fact that we have long been and now are on the gold standard.

A MEMBER. If we are now on the gold standard, what is the necessity of this bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Well, the necessity for this bill arises from the fact that, notwithstanding we are on the gold standard and have been for more than two generations, there are some of the boys on your side that have not heard of it yet. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

As a matter of fact, we are on the gold standard and have been for practical purposes since 1834. The law of that year, by treating 16 ounces of silver as equivalent to 1 ounce of gold, effectually excluded the coinage of silver dollars, because the material was worth more in the market than the nominal value of the coin. Therefore nobody presented the silver for coinage, and even fractional currency gradually disappeared from circulation and use. The country could not even keep a 10-cent piece in circulation until the act of 1853 had debased fractional coins and authorized their manufacture in limited quantities out of material bought on Government account.

There can be no question that the act of 1853 was intended to do away with the inconvenience of attempting to maintain two standards of value. Mr. Dunham, of Indiana, who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in a speech which will be found in the Appendix to the Congressional Globe, volume 6, page 190, said distinctly on this floor:

We intend to do what the best writers on political economy have approved, what experience, where the experiment has been tried, has demonstrated to be the best, and what the committee believe to be necessary and proper—to make but one standard of currency and to make all others subservient to it. We mean to make the gold the standard coin and to make these new silver coins applicable and convenient, not for large but for small transactions.

These matters have been discussed in various forms in books and in pamphlets in recent years, but the clearest and most satisfactory discussion of them which has come under my notice will be found in a recent work published by the Putnams on *The History of American Coinage*, by our old colleague, affectionately remembered in this House, D. K. Watson, of Ohio, now a member of the commission to revise and codify the laws of the United States. For painstaking research and impartial historical accuracy this book is a most admirable treatise on this subject, worthy of a place in the library of every student. Nor can there be any sound dissent from Mr. Watson's conclusion that the effect of the passage of the act of 1853—

Was just what the leading members of Congress said it would be when it was being discussed in the House of Representatives. It effectually put the country on the gold basis, thus supplementing the effect of the act of 1834.—*History of the American Coinage*, page 134, second edition; Putnam's Sons, 1899.

I repeat, therefore, that for practical purposes we have been on the gold basis for more than two generations. If we were not put there by the act of 1834, the act of 1853 completed it; and if there was any doubt about it after 1853, it was finally resolved in 1873, although it took the Democratic party some time to find out what was done at that time, and nearly twenty-five years to get really excited on the subject. [Laughter on the Republican side.] You need not be distressed; I am not going to defend myself or anybody else against the crime of 1873. I have made myself reasonably familiar with the literature of that subject, even going to the extent of reading the speeches which repose in the peaceful tomb of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am going to be absolutely frank here, and I do not want anybody on the other side to draw a "quotation" on me [laughter], whether it is what I may have said or what somebody else has said. [Renewed laughter.]

Of course, if anybody intends to do that, there is probably no way for me to prevent it, but I want you to understand in advance that I am not to be embarrassed by anybody's speeches or votes in the years that have intervened since the "crime." [Laughter.] I would like to agree with others, and I have a pardonable ambition to agree with myself, but for the purpose of disposing of this business I do not intend to be constrained by what this man or that man said or did twenty years ago, and I do not propose to be bound by what I said and did myself.

Mr. COX. You admit that you were wrong all the time?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will let others explain their own mistakes. I have not been here long enough to make all the mistakes possible to be made about silver. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. You have made a good many.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I confess only one. I confess that I shared in the general stupidity in respect to the law of 1890, which required the daily purchase of 6 tons of pig silver to be paid for with promissory notes. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. And the trouble is that you have not got through with it yet.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Hardly a session of Congress has passed since 1890 that some enterprising member has not risen on this floor and read out loud a paragraph from the speech I made here, or rather printed in the RECORD without making it, in 1890, on the silver legislation of that year. It has been used to show that I was at that time in favor of the "free and unlimited." In point of fact, in 1890 I had my first opportunity to put in a vote against 16 to 1, and I have always had some satisfaction in the fact that there never has been a session of Congress from that time until now that I did not have at least one such opportunity. [Laughter.] So that there is one thing I ought not to be accused of, and that is that I have ever supported a proposition to manufacture our dollars of material worth less than a dollar, for the benefit of the gentlemen who owned the material, and that is some satisfaction. [Applause.]

But in 1890 I voted for the act which I now regard as of unquestionably bad policy, the act for the purchase of the silver bullion to be piled up in the Treasury of the United States. I did it because Senator TELLER of Colorado and Senator Sherman of Ohio both agreed in thinking that the purchase of the entire American product would restore the parity between gold and silver. I thought that when 16 to 1 became thus the actual ratio between gold and silver free coinage would be easy and unobjectionable, and my troubles have arisen from the fact that before I got through I ventured the prediction that during Harrison's Administration that state of affairs would come to pass and the free coinage of silver be entered upon without inconvenience, difficulty, or danger. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. COX. You say that you voted for that law, and that when you voted for it you made a speech?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I voted for it and slipped a speech on the subject into the RECORD before I went home.

Mr. COX. And you were wrong about that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Well, I am trying to apologize for it, Colonel. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX. I am trying to get you out of the hole which you put your party in. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. We have been trying ever since to get out, though I hardly think we have profited very much by your assistance. When we came in 1893 to repeal that law I confess that I was in the greatest perplexity of mind. The country was in the midst of an unexampled panic, and while I have always believed that Mr. Cleveland grossly overstated the responsibility of that law for the untoward events which followed his election, at the same time there can be no doubt that the policy of piling up silver in the Treasury, purchased by the issue of promissory notes payable on demand, contributed materially to the distrust and confusion of the business community. In such an emergency, as so often happens under our system of government, party lines were forgotten and the Republican party upon the call of a Democratic President had the courage to undo the blunder of 1890. When I came down here to the extra session I had an idea that maybe I was the only person entirely at sea on the questions that brought the Congress together.

I remember that one day as I was passing the house of Senator Sherman, then as now everywhere regarded as one of the wisest and safest authorities upon financial matters, and saw him sitting out in front of his home, like Abraham before his tent. I went in and talked with him about my anxieties and fears, and I shall never forget the simplicity and kindness with which he spoke to me—that simplicity which characterizes all great minds. He said that “if I were in your place I would not worry about these questions. Twenty years ago I thought I knew a good deal about the silver question, but every prediction I have ever made on the subject in our efforts to restore the value of silver bullion has turned out exactly opposite to what I expected.”

Mr. COX. That is the way it is going to do again. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. So that when I listened to my friend from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], making predictions on this subject, I made up my mind that if he had been troubled in the past by the predictions of other years, as many on this side of the House have been, he would have been more economical with his prophecies about the future. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Senator Sherman was of the opinion that if we bought all the silver produced in the United States as fast as it was produced we would restore the ratio. But Congress forgot at least one element which enters into the law of commercial demand, and that was that the purchase of silver bullion to be piled up in the Treasury is not such a consumption of it as would materially affect the price. We know more on this subject than we did even ten years ago. To-day there are few competent students in any country who believe that the act of one nation putting a stamp on an ingot of silver is providing such a consumption of it in an economic sense as would materially affect the ratio of its value compared to gold.

I have concluded, being guided by what has happened to us, that the law of 1873, in omitting the silver dollar of a former generation from our list of authorized coins, was an act of farsighted wisdom, worthy of the Administration of General Grant. [Applause on the Republican side.] We have seen hard-pressed politicians drag General Grant from his grave for the purpose of holding him up for public contempt as one who did not know what his own Administration was doing and what laws his own right hand was signing. Others, more bold and more infamous still, have not hesitated to say that he deliberately sold out in secret the interests of his country for the sake of the moneyed class in the United States. If there was ever any force in these accusations they are decayed and lifeless now, for the American people, cherishing that stainless name in their hearts, will go no further to justify the act of 1873 than to recollect the immortal signature, “Approved. Feb. 12, 1873. U. S. Grant.” [Applause on the Republican side.]

If the act of 1873 had remained undisturbed by subsequent silver legislation, all or nearly all of our monetary problems would have been simplified, if not avoided altogether. I say that notwithstanding the party in which I have served all my life is responsible for all that has ever been done for silver. I do not accuse our friends of the Democratic party of ever having helped silver at all. During the whole of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration you never even offered a bill on this subject in this House, though you had a majority here and though the slender Republican majority in the Senate was made up from the silver States.

And the last time you elected Mr. Cleveland President of the United States I charge that you elected him well knowing that he was the most hostile factor in the politics of the country against the free coinage of silver. He was not nominated by the money power of New York. Either the money power of New York had no influence or else they used it to send delegates malignant in their antipathy to Mr. Cleveland, because in his nomination what you have described as the money power of the East was overruled by the South and the West, and thus Mr. Cleveland was a second time made leader of the Democratic party. You think you did a bad thing for yourselves, but I tell you that you

unintentionally did a first-rate thing for the American people. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

It may be said, therefore, that the silver question was never seriously taken up in the United States until 1896. You on that side never allowed your dim and nebulous convictions on the subject to interfere with your electing its chief enemy President, and we on our side never hesitated to write our platform for the entertainment of our Rocky Mountain friends. But in 1896 the American people brushed politics aside and sat down in solemn earnest to settle an issue that had been the plaything of the politics of the American people for a quarter of a century. The argument for free coinage was not new. For fifteen years it had reposed peacefully on a mass of statistics and a scrapbook of garbled extracts and worthless political speeches. In the first months of the campaign all these were brought to the front—what Mr. Carlisle said; what Mr. Blaine said; how Mr. CANNON voted; how Mr. McKinley voted—but the American people insisted on going to the root of the question.

The campaign opened with a blare of trumpets and in the Mississippi Valley it looked as if everything was going Democratic, so much so that politicians who had failed in the business in the Republican fold got quickly into the silver camp, declaring with genuine exhilaration that 16 to 1 was sweeping the country like a prairie fire. These are the people that are entitled to our sympathy to-day as they gather together in disconsolate committee meetings to talk with one another about old times and to enjoy the meager remnants of a political importance that has long since disappeared. [Laughter.]

In July, 1896, the people of the United States began to argue the silver question on the stump, at their firesides, in great political assemblies, and when they were through, my humble opinion is that the debate for practical purposes was over. If the State of Iowa, where we are nearly all farmers, had voted one way, and the State of Massachusetts, where they are nearly all engaged in mercantile and industrial pursuits, had voted the other, there might be some doubt about it, although I would stand by the judgment of the 80,000 majority of farmers in Iowa. But when a proposition gets a black eye at the same election in the State of Iowa and in the State of Massachusetts by about the same majority, I tell you that there is no future for that proposition in an intellectual life of the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I desire to call your attention to two reasons which sent the silver agitation to the wall before that campaign was half over. In the first place the questions that arose were questions of fact, and the campaign had not gone on four weeks before the American people found out that the facts you folks were relying upon were in the nature of fakes and humbugs. For instance, Mr. Bryan, in the address, to which I have alluded, to the women of Minneapolis, illustrated the effect of the demonetization of silver in 1873 by comparing it to the destruction of one of two piles of wheat of equal size, and declared that the destruction of one-half of the metal money of the country had naturally doubled the value of the other half, thereby cutting into the value of all other property; had sent the value of property down by sending money up.

That was the argument, and the only objection to the conclusions that came from it was that it was not true, and the more people examined into it the less they believed it to be true. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. What argument did you make for silver?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have not had, Mr. Chairman, to ask forgiveness for making any. [Laughter and applause.] In the first place, the silver dollar from the foundation of our mint had never entered into the volume of the currency of the country, the total aggregate coinage hardly exceeding \$8,000,000, so that it was literally true that the law of 1873 had never taken from the American people any use of silver which they had at the time enjoyed. There was of course some force in the proposition that the legislation of commercial Europe might have injuriously affected the value of silver, but nobody in his senses could make out how you could correct by the legislation of a country which had not used silver the hostile policy by those countries which actually had used it.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. With your present lights and information before you, are you now in favor of opening the doors of the mints to the free coinage of silver by international agreement?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No, sir; I am not. I have joined in the last experiment with silver, on an international basis or otherwise. [Applause on the Republican side.] I have been humbugged as long as I calculate to be, if I know it. There is certainly no pressure for international agreement now such as might have reasonably existed five years ago, because if the Director of the Mint is correct the world's supply of gold has grown with such an amazing annual increment that before the end of the next year it will more than equal the total aggregate of gold and silver put

together when the St. Louis platform was adopted; so that I think that those who believed in international bimetalism will find small necessity for the further agitation of that subject, while those who only acquiesced in the efforts of our Government to promote the international agreement no longer feel the slightest pressure of duty in that regard.

Another thing the American people wanted to know was what was to be the result to them if they should indulge in this scheme of free coinage, and there was in public life no man who even pretended to be able to predict the result of the policy. Nobody could tell what the value of the free-coinage dollar would be. Mr. Bryan himself first said one thing and then another. In New York when he accepted the nomination he said, as the frost of that occasion was settling upon him, that the result would be to produce a coin exactly equal to the gold dollar; but long before he got back to the West he was denouncing the gold dollar as a two-hundred-cent affair and declaring that the rights of the poor man could only be protected by cutting its inflated value in two; so that the historian will never know exactly what Mr. Bryan's views of the question were. He was candid enough, however, to admit that he did not pretend to be dealing with an exact science; that he did not know what the effect would be of beginning the free coinage of silver; that it was an experiment and he was willing to try it. He was traveling without baggage at the time [laughter] and was ready to try it.

Governor Boies, of Iowa, did not hesitate to write, in response to a question propounded by the New York World, that it was impossible to predict what the effect would be of giving free coinage of silver; and Senator Vest, a wiser man than both, on the floor of the Senate solemnly stated that the human mind had not the faculties which enabled it to foretell what the effect of this policy would be.

The American people were in a situation better calculated to invite experiments than they are likely again soon to be. Their business was at a standstill; their property was shrunken in value; their debts were pressing upon them; the hands of labor were everywhere idle, and the products of labor lay in a dead market place, diminished in value almost beyond human belief.

With such surroundings the special car made its pilgrimage throughout the United States, and it is not surprising that so many troubled hearts made a favorable response to the eager rhapsodies which had done business beyond the Missouri for so many years. It will be written in our history, in vindication of our institutions and as an everlasting witness for popular government, that the American people, standing in the midst of their prostrate fortunes, weary and heavy laden under burdens too heavy to be borne, deliberately chose, trampling under foot the temptations of the hour, to bear the ills they had, rather than fly to others which they knew not of. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have heard boast made of the number who followed the free-silver banner. I have always wondered that there were not more. I recollect an earnest conversation I had once in this Chamber with Judge Boatner, of Louisiana, a sincere and patriotic man. We agreed that the proposed policy might produce unexpected misfortunes, and I did not in the least lose my respect for him when he said that he was going with his party because nothing could happen to his people worse than had already come upon them. It is not surprising that communities which in literal despair of their business surroundings looked hither and thither in hope of relief should give a friendly ear to those who were offering them a distinct remedy for their evils.

The success of the patent-medicine industry of the United States is an interesting testimony that such infirmities of human nature are prevalent in the world. You on your side had a distinct advantage over us. You knew exactly what you were going to do; and curiously enough in this world a man has a great advantage over everyone else when he has an exact remedy at hand. We on our part had to indulge in arguments, in expressions of hope, in appeals to experience.

Mr. Bryan, for instance, found the farmers of the West selling corn for 10 cents a bushel, and he came to them and said, "Now, that is too low a price for corn," and every farmer in the United States said, "That is right;" and I say that that was so; and the place I parted company with Mr. Bryan was as to the remedy for that state of things. He said the way to increase the price of corn was to cut in two the value of the dollar. He said the reason that corn was 10 cents a bushel was because the dollar was a 200-cent dollar, and he went to our debt-burdened people and proposed deliberately to double the price of the products of the farm by cutting in two the value of the standard coin of the realm.

The American people studied that proposition carefully, and the more they studied it the less they liked it; and while they were engaged in the study of it they heard a voice from a little vine-covered portico of a cottage yonder in Canton, Ohio, saying:

Open the mills of the United States; give the American people something to do for a living; give their old employments back and their old wages, and

you will create a market that will very speedily restore the price of farm products and of all other products of labor in the United States.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I will appeal to the experience of every man whether that philosophy of our affairs has not turned out to be the true philosophy. Mr. Bryan said that we did not have money enough in circulation, and he may have been right about that; for the fact was, we did not have very much money in circulation at the time he was performing his most famous acts in the field of oratory and eloquence. Everybody that had any money held onto it; everybody that had any money in the banks went and got it; everybody that sold goods for cash took the money home; so that the channels of trade were without circulation and the money of the American people was hidden away in the private hoards of a panic-stricken community.

I appeal to every business man's experience whether the decisive vote of the American people adverse to Mr. Bryan's candidacy did not immediately unlock the hoarded money of the United States. In every bank the very next morning after that election you could tell that something had happened. There was a queer smell in the bank—a smell somewhat like the odor of the old north room in a New England homestead, peculiar but not disagreeable [laughter]—a smell of hoarded gold brought from its hiding place and laid down again on the bank counter to reopen an account.

That vote of the American people did more. It put the loanable funds of the whole world at the disposal of the business of this country, so that money flowed from all quarters for investment in the United States. As a result, we have not only seen the money which we had put back into circulation, but in the last three years the aggregate volume of money in the United States has increased by leaps and bounds. You will admit that by the free coinage of silver about all you could have done for us would have been to manufacture silver dollars as fast as you could. Even supposing that the unlimited issue of a coin inferior in value to the corresponding coin of gold would not have instantly taken away from us what money we had in gold, depreciating our whole money supply to the silver standard, all you proposed to do for us was to open the mints and begin the manufacture of silver dollars.

You thought that would increase the money supply. We believed that its immediate and fatal effect would have been to drive away our whole volume of gold coinage; but even if we were wrong as to that and your policy did not affect the circulation of gold, still your policy would have been a poor recourse, under the circumstances, compared with ours. The Director of the Mint tells me that if all the mints in the United States worked all the time, night and day, and did nothing else, they could manufacture only 50,000,000 silver dollars in a year. The Secretary of the Treasury tells me that since William McKinley was inaugurated there has been added to the volume of money in the United States the stupendous aggregate sum of \$400,000,000, most of it in gold and all of it as good as gold. Now let me make that a little clearer. If you had worked all the mints all the time you could have manufactured out of silver only \$150,000,000 since William McKinley was inaugurated; but our policy has given to the business of the American people \$400,000,000 in less than three years, an amount which would have taken all the mints of the United States, working all the time, eight years to manufacture out of silver.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. And every dollar is worth a hundred cents.

Mr. DOLLIVER. My friend says that every dollar is worth a hundred cents. That is the best thing about it. Every man who gets a dollar by the labor of his hands or the sale of his products knows that that dollar is as good as gold everywhere in the world. In other words, brethren, we have done for you at least four times as much as you expected to be able to do for yourselves; and now why would it not be a good idea for you to get out of the main traveled road and let the procession move on? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In 1896 Mr. Bryan said in a score of speeches, preserved in this curious volume, that if the gold standard was fastened upon this country, the price of everything would go down and keep going down under a law as inexorable as the law of gravitation.

Do you think we have reached the end of the gold standard?—

He cried, addressing the people of Baltimore September 19—

There is no end. Do you think that we have drained the cup of sorrow to its dregs? No, my friends, you can not set a limit to financial depression and hard times.

Is there a man on this floor to-day, regardless of his politics, who will stand up here and say publicly that in making these statements Mr. Bryan knew what he was talking about? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] If there is, I would like to have him stand up. [After a pause.] I now call the attention of the country to the fact that the Democratic party in this House has become so bewildered by the industrial and commercial activity which surrounds us that not one of his followers

will stand up here and say that on a question which goes to the heart of this controversy Mr. Bryan had sufficient wisdom to guide the footsteps of those less enlightened than himself. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] He said wages would come down and the working people of the United States be left without employment. Was he right about that? When he spoke there were a good many in this country in that condition, and my heart always went out in sympathy to these industrious millions and their helpless families.

I expect we had as much sympathy as you folks had, even though we did not coincide with your scheme for restoring wages and happiness. Let us all rejoice that after less than three years of Republican Administration there is not an industrious man out of employment—not one in the United States. Not only are the great centers of industry and commerce busy, but a revival has taken place even in the remote villages and rural districts.

It may interest you to know that since the last session of this House I have become a farmer. [Laughter.] Last summer when I wanted to build a barn I walked all over a town of 12,000 people trying to get somebody to put a foundation under it, and I declare to you that I had finally to put it in myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARHAM. Is the barn still standing?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is, and in every respect a good job. If you have kept your eye on the newspapers, you have noticed that the wages of labor are everywhere steadily going up, adding millions of dollars to the comfort of the humble homes of the land; so that when Mr. Bryan predicted a still further loss of employment and a still further decline in wages the whole world now knows that he was wrong and not right. I do not think any the less of him personally because his speeches have not come out true. When a man tells me that it is going to rain and it turns out to be a sunshiny day, I do not have any less respect for his moral character. [Laughter.] But where a man predicts dry weather and plentiful showers fall instead, I insist that unless he expects to hear a personal application of the proverb by which the mental outfit of such a one is described, he should at least get in out of the rain. [Laughter.]

Mr. Bryan in 1896 claimed that the restoration of prosperity in the United States was entirely impossible except under his general management, and I here publicly convict him, by the open book of universal experience, of wholesale and retail dealing in misfortunes that never come. He told the multitudes, which had a right to look to him for wisdom and guidance, that the design of the friends of the gold standard was to put it in the power of a few bankers to corner the money of the world.

Talk about monopolies, talk about trusts—

He said, speaking in this city on the centennial of Washington's Farewell Address—

my friends, they propose to establish the most gigantic trust of all—a money trust—and let a few men who hold it all deal it out at such price as they will to all the others of the 70,000,000 American people.

You will see that his idea was even cruder than that just uttered by my friend from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], that those interested in banking and other business enterprises of the country are conspiring together for the purpose of disturbing the national prosperity—of wiping out the very thing which makes any kind of business either profitable or possible.

There are men in this House who, from the habit of bringing cheap prejudices into things which ought to be entirely free from prejudice, seem perfectly capable of believing that the banks of the United States are likely some day to get together and form a conspiracy to throw themselves into the hands of a receiver. [Laughter.]

With the same dull and baffled insight into practical questions, Mr. Bryan insisted that the money power was about to take the American people by the throat and shake out of them what little remained of their industrial and commercial life. I take this occasion to say that if the money power did conspire to multiply the sorrows of poverty and debt in the United States, the conspiracy has turned out to be the worst failure imaginable.

During General Harrison's Administration, when it was comparatively easy to get into debt, I took advantage of the fair sailing which seemed to be before us and bought as much land as I could borrow money to make a payment on. Everybody seemed to be willing to loan money; they even stopped me on the street and asked me if I could not use a little money, and the most embarrassing thing I had to contend with during the campaign of 1896 was that these fellows all wanted to see me. I sent down word that I was not in. [Laughter.] They said that they would wait. [Renewed laughter.] So it took a good deal more ingenuity to keep my creditors in an agreeable state of mind during the campaign than it did to refute the bogus bimetalism of 16 to 1. [Laughter.] It is a relief to know that the burden of debt has been lifted not only from my own shoulders but from the scattered millions of my countrymen. The mortgages of the United States which have come due since Mr. Bryan's defeat have all been either paid or refunded at a rate of interest lower than ever before seen and tending lower still.

In view of that state of things, what becomes of the motto which Mr. Bryan saw carried in a procession at Lexington, Ky., in the fall of 1896? "I challenge you," said he, "to find in any one of the speeches that will be made this year by the opponents of free silver a single sentence which contains as much of political economy and common sense as is contained in that phrase, 'High money—low times.'"

That might have been political economy and common sense in 1896, but who will deny that it is balderdash and mere declamation now? I know what I am talking about. Not long ago I bought a piece of land which had a mortgage of \$6,000, drawn at the rate of interest which prevailed in 1895 and having a reservation of the right to pay it in whole or in part on any interest day.

When the April interest came due this year I said to myself, "Would not it be a good idea for you to show your faith in Republican predictions? You told your constituents that if the standard of value was made secure public and private credit would be strengthened and that the interest on money, instead of going up, would go down. Would it not be a good thing to see whether it will operate in your own case or not?" I did not have the money and did not know where I would be able to get it, but I thought I would see whether the Republican platform was worth anything to me, and so when I wrote to the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company of Milwaukee, inclosing a draft for the interest due April 1, I added this postscript:

P. S.—Unless it is agreeable to your company to reduce the rate of interest on these notes to 5 per cent, I will feel obliged to pay them.

[Laughter.]

Three days afterwards I got a letter from the manager of the company, saying that my letter had been referred to the committee on finance, and in accordance with its report—

it is entirely agreeable to our company to reduce the rate on your notes to 5 per cent, provided you will waive the right to pay them before they are due.

[Laughter.]

I want to say to you, boys, that I have had a good many hard knocks in my time and a good many hand-to-hand conflicts with trouble; I have heard you speak about the conspiracies of Wall street and Lombard street until I have sometimes felt like sharing your fears for the future, and I tell you now that I never in my life, before I got that letter, felt that I had the money power of Europe and America on the dead run. [Loud laughter.]

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Does the gentleman give his experience in that business transaction as the rule which governs the Republican party?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is the experience of every farmer, of every business man, of every man in the least interested in the borrowing and lending of money.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. You do not seem to catch my question. I mean when you deceived that insurance company.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I did not deceive them at all; I simply bluffed them. [Great laughter on the Republican side.] Is there a Democrat in this House who has any scruples against that? [Renewed laughter.]

In other words, my countrymen, three years under the Administration of William McKinley has taken all of the terror out of the gold standard, not only for the Republican party, but for the industrious millions of America. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. I thought you said that we had the gold standard since 1834.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But we have had several Democratic Administrations in the meantime, and I am talking now about the effect of the last election and about our desire and purpose to give expression in the law to the verdict of the people taken three years ago. I say frankly that it could not have been done two years ago or one year ago, but it can be done to-day by the unanimous vote of the Republican members of this House, because our pathway has been lit up by the experience of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is gratifying also to say that there is not a man on this side that is constrained by the action of the caucus, for the vote in the caucus was a unanimous vote if I may be pardoned for letting out a secret which I have already seen in the newspapers. [Laughter.]

Here, as the American people stand at the beginning of a new era, full of hope and courage, we propose to equip the business community with the best tool of exchange known to modern commerce. We propose to send our ships into all harbors, as we have raised our flag in the uttermost parts of the earth; we want it understood in Europe and America, in Africa, and in Asia, and in the islands of the sea that there is no longer any question as to what the standard dollar of the United States is. [Applause.] We want a draft on New York, expressed in dollars, drawn in Manila, to be as intelligible in the Orient as if drawn in pounds sterling on the Bank of England.

Wherever our fleets go, wherever our flag floats, we will place our dealings with the world above suspicion and beyond reproach. [Applause.] And so we are going to listen respectfully to your

speeches; and while we may smile to ourselves as you attack the hydra-headed monsters of Lombard street and of Wall street, we intend to quietly write in the laws of this country what has always been the practice of the Government, that every obligation of the United States shall be paid in gold.

When a man comes to the counter of our Treasury we are going to lay down two coins before him, the gold dollar and the silver dollar. We will say to him, "There are our coins; they are exactly of equal value; one is the standard and the other is at par with the standard; the credit of the United States, all that we are, all that we have, is pledged to make one just as good as the other; take your choice. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is presented as the caucus measure of the Republican party. That party is in possession of both the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It is therefore safe to assume that the bill contains all the combined wisdom of the greatest minds in the dominant party upon the subject of finance; in other words, that it is the very best upon that subject of which you gentlemen on the other side of the House are capable. Were you capable of anything better, I fancy that you would have lost no time in telling us so. I represent a constituency in the city of New York that will probably be as vitally affected by the passage of this bill as will any in the United States. If I am to vote for it, I must be convinced not only that it does no harm, but that it does good, and that it improves existing conditions. There is a class of men who sincerely believe that all ills can be remedied by legislation; that no evil can be so great that an act of Congress will not set it right. I believe that one of the curses of our country is too much legislation, and that unless positive, actual good can be accomplished it is better to let well enough alone.

I take it that the purpose that has actuated the majority in introducing this bill, that has set them tinkering with our national finances, that has caused them to proceed in this extraordinarily hasty and indecent manner, is the ambition to live up to a certain pledge said to be contained in the last Republican national platform. I confess that it is a helpful and a hopeful sign that the Republican party is willing to live up to any promise whatsoever. [Laughter.] Hastily conceived and crudely drawn, its consequences unweighed and its results unknown, the Republican majority is to be dragooned into voting for this bill in proof of the alleged conversion of its leaders from the Republican bimetalism of 1892 to the new doctrine of Republican monometallism of 1896.

I do not wish it understood that I advocate the present system of bank-note currency. The first direct consequence of the enactment of this bill will be a very great rise in the market price of Government bonds. Let me illustrate by one class of bonds. In 1895, when the then President of the United States was negotiating with the so-called "bond syndicate" for the issue of a fifty-million-dollar loan, the gentlemen who composed that syndicate agreed to take a 3 per cent gold bond at par instead of a 4 per cent coin bond authorized by the act of January 14, 1875, at 104½. In other words, in their opinion, and it is conceded that they are the shrewdest, ablest financiers living, a 4 per cent coin bond at 104½ is equal in value to a 3 per cent gold bond at par. Now, the enactment of the bill before the House will at once make all our coin bonds gold bonds, and according to the theory of the bond syndicate, which I am unwilling to dispute, a 4 per cent coin bond at 104½ will be equal in value to a 4 per cent gold bond at 133½; but the coin bonds that were issued at 104½ are now worth in the market 134. So that by this reasoning the substitution of the word "gold" for the word "coin" must increase their market price to 171, an increase of 27½ per cent. If this be true in reference to this one issue, it will necessarily be true in reference to all our outstanding coin bonds.

It may be said in answer to this that my figures are exaggerated and that our coin bonds are to-day virtually gold bonds and selling on a gold basis, and that the substitution of the word "gold" for the word "coin" will not increase their market value. If this is true, then our credit is not nearly as good as is that of Great Britain, a proposition that I fancy no member of this House will care to indorse. The average price of British consols during the year 1897 was a trifle under 113. Were the interest increased to 4 per cent the consol would be worth 164½; yet the consol is not by any manner of means as desirable a bond, even at the same rate of interest, as our 1925 4 per cents will be when made gold bonds. If our 1925 4 per cents are to-day gold bonds, when reduced to the terms of consols they would be worth only 92, or \$210 less, bond for bond, than consols.

I pass over the fact that the substitution of the word "gold" for the word "coin" will result in presenting an unearned bonus of \$60,056,735 to the holders of the loan of 1925 alone. If this bill is of such vital importance to the country, as its supporters half-heartedly insist, the mere presentation to the national bondholders of an unearned premium of 27½ per cent should not be allowed to weigh against it. But let us consider what will be the effect of the rise in the market price of our bonds.

Another section of this bill permits our national banks to issue bank notes up to the par value of their holdings in United States bonds, instead of up to 90 per cent, as they are at present authorized, and substitutes a franchise tax for the present tax of 1 per cent on bank-note issues. Why? Because it is conceded, and rightly so, that the market price of Government bonds is to-day so high that it is more profitable for our national banks to sell their bond holdings and to reinvest the proceeds in other securities than it is to hold them as collateral for the issue of bank notes up to 90 per cent of the par value of their holdings. This bill proposes to increase the authorized issue of bank notes one-ninth, while at the same time it increases the market value of our bonds one-fourth. If it is unprofitable to-day to issue bank notes, how much more unprofitable will it be after the enactment of this bill?

Under present conditions for every 4 per cent bond of the issue of 1925 held by a national bank \$900 in bank notes may be issued, which, if loaned at 4 per cent with the tax of 1 per cent deducted, means a profit of \$27 a year; add to this \$40 interest on the bond makes a total profit of \$67. Were the bond sold at the market price and the proceeds, \$1,340, invested at 4 per cent, the profit for the year would be \$53.60, or only \$13.40 in favor of the bank-note issue, scarcely enough to pay for the annoyance of submitting to the law in reference to bank-note issues.

By the proposed plan, for every 4 per cent bond of the issue of 1925 held by a national bank, \$1,000 in bank notes may be issued, which, if loaned at 4 per cent with no tax deducted, would mean a profit of \$40 a year; add to this \$40 interest on the bond would make a profit of \$80. Were the bond sold at what would be its market price, the word "gold" having been substituted for the word "coin," and the proceeds, \$1,710, invested at 4 per cent, the profit for the year would be \$68.40, or only \$11.60 in favor of the bank-note issue and \$1.80 less than under existing conditions. Instead of increasing the number of banks of issue, this bill, if enacted, will reduce them to the vanishing point, and cause the disappearance of the \$243,842,068 in bank notes outstanding December 1, 1899, and the consequent contraction of the currency to that extent.

A glance at the following table will make my meaning clear:

UNDER PRESENT SYSTEM.	
Interest on one bond at 4 per cent	\$40.00
Bank lends \$900 in notes at 4 per cent	36.00
Total	76.00
Less 1 per cent tax	9.00
Net profit for one year	67.00
Bank sells bond and invests proceeds, \$1,340, at 4 per cent ..	53.60
Difference in favor of bank-note issue	13.40
UNDER PROPOSED SYSTEM.	
Interest on one bond at 4 per cent	\$40.00
Bank lends \$1,000 in notes at 4 per cent (no tax)	40.00
Net profit for one year	80.00
Bank sells bond and invests proceeds, \$1,710, at 4 per cent ..	68.40
Difference in favor of bank-note issue	11.60
Or \$1.80 less than and in favor of existing system.	

During the debate I have heard this remarkable utterance:

There can be no contraction of the currency under this system, for the reason that either the note is in circulation, or, if redeemed, its equivalent is in circulation.

This statement is worthy of the ignorance that has inspired the bill. There are in circulation \$405,253,656 Treasury notes and United States notes which, under the terms of this bill, must be redeemed in gold, and once redeemed not reissued except for gold. For the sake of argument, let us assume that the enactment of this bill will find as much gold in the Treasury as there was December 7, 1899; that is, \$239,462,213.43.

This is an assumption which I think is entirely unwarranted, but I am willing to make it for the purpose of presenting the case for this bill in the most favorable light possible. When all this gold has been used for redemption purposes, there will still remain \$165,761,443 of notes outstanding to be redeemed, and, moreover, the gold reserve must be brought up to the \$100,000,000 mark. In other words, gold to that amount must be procured by the sale of bonds, and must necessarily be taken from the gold in circulation; so that by the most charitable view of this bill the circulation will be contracted \$265,761,443, and the bonded debt of the country will have been increased by that amount at an annual cost of \$7,972,843. This will mean a total contraction of \$509,603,511.

In estimating the volume of the currency in a country it is necessary to take into consideration the check money, which in all civilized nations plays so important a part. It is necessary to consider the rapidity with which credit can be transferred by means

of an extended and sound banking system. Thus India, one of the most populous and also one of the poorest countries on earth, has a per capita circulation of \$2.39; China a per capita circulation of \$1.96—both almost ignorant of the use of check money and of banking facilities in our acceptance of the term; while France and Germany, much less populous, but far more prosperous and well provided with banks, have, respectively, per capita circulations of \$35.19 and \$19.38, without taking into account the very large amount of check money that circulates side by side with the legal-tender money.

The volume of currency necessary for the transaction of business in any country depends, not upon the size of the population, but upon the amount of that country's wealth. As it is impossible to estimate with any accuracy the amount of wealth in a country, it has become the custom, for the purposes of comparison, to express the amount of circulating medium in proportion to its population. While this is not always a safe measure of the amount of needed circulation, it is safe to say that in ordinarily prosperous times the per capita of circulation will represent the amount required in the ordinary transactions of business. On the 1st of December, 1899, the total circulation per capita in the United States was \$25.85, which probably represents the smallest amount of circulation with which business can be carried on without resorting to temporary and clumsy makeshifts, such as clearing house certificates. As a result of the contraction which will be caused by this bill, the circulation per capita will be reduced to \$19.21, or less than that of almost any other solvent country on earth, with the exception of the United Kingdom, whose banking facilities are far superior to our own and which possesses an elastic currency the like of which we have never known.

You have claimed that you were the friend of the business man in this country. You have insisted that, as a party, your one ambition was to make this country prosperous. Through no effort of yours the country is prosperous, and now you assume that you were the cause of its prosperity, but you are unwilling to let well enough alone, and propose to improve conditions which you had no part in bringing about. Any business man will tell you that one of the chief dangers to the prosperity of this country is the inelasticity of our present monetary system; that under present conditions our currency is not capable of expansion or of contraction to meet the needs of trade. Every man employed in trade realizes that he has constantly hanging over his head, threatening him with bankruptcy, the danger of "tight money."

If this is true in the great commercial cities, it is doubly a menace in sections of the country far removed from the money centers. You have the Government in all its branches; you have the power; you profess a philanthropic friendship for the business interests of this country; and yet, instead of trying to remedy the condition of affairs that exists to-day, you propose by this bill to make matters infinitely worse by withdrawing the only semi-elastic currency we have, by contracting the circulation 25 per cent, and by reducing the per capita to \$19.21. The enactment of this bill, revolutionizing the financial system of the country from top to bottom, contracting the currency and reducing the per capita, will be followed by a money famine which must lead to the destruction of confidence and credit and to a commercial panic the like of which this country has never seen.

You are willing to risk all this; you are willing to sacrifice that prosperity which you claim has come because of you, and which we claim has come despite you; you are willing to ruin thousands and to plunge hundreds of thousands into undeserved poverty, light heartedly, unthinkingly, for the purpose of redeeming a platform promise, for the purpose of a little cheap political advantage. The results of the enactment of this bill will be, first, the making of our already inelastic currency still more rigid; second, the increase of our bonded debt over \$265,000,000, and of our annual interest charges nearly \$8,000,000; third, the contraction of the currency by over \$509,000,000 and the reduction of the per capita circulation to \$19.21; and, fourth, the substitution for the endless chain of greenbacks, as at present, of an endless chain of silver dollars, to be redeemed, reissued, and reredemed in gold as often as presented.

With a proper regard for my duty as a Representative from New York, with a conscientious desire to serve the best interests of my country, I can not bring myself to vote for this bill.

I have heard it said, Mr. Chairman, that some gentlemen on this side of the House, some sound-money Democrats, intend to vote for this bill, because they are convinced that by so doing they will aid the cause of sound money. I sincerely trust that I have been misinformed. I had firmly believed until recently that the Democratic party upon the floor of this House would present a united front in opposition to this bill. I had hoped that those who believe in the free coinage of silver at the fixed ratio of 16 to 1, without the aid or consent of any other nation, would have been joined by those who, while believing in bimetalism, doubt the possibility of maintaining the parity of the metals under free coinage.

Sound-money Democrats, this bill does not aid the cause of

sound money. I beg you, I implore you, before you resolve to cast your votes for it, bring to its consideration all the patriotism that is in you; ask yourselves if the passage of this bill will not be the end of all financial legislation, at least during our time; ask yourselves if the passage of this bill will not forever prevent a just and a proper reform of the currency; ask yourselves if this bill is not the severest blow that has ever been aimed at a sound financial system. And if, as I believe you will, you decide that this is a bad bill, and that its passage will not be for the best interests of the country, then stand up side by side with the party you all love and to which you all belong, and help to cast an undivided and a united Democratic vote against one of the worst pieces of legislation ever submitted to the United States Congress. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOPKINS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages from the President in writing were communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The committee resumed its session, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair. Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to detain the committee with any remarks this afternoon. I thought if I should speak at all it would be at a later stage in the course of this discussion. But it seems that no one upon our side is prepared to speak just now, and much of my time may be taken up in committee duties after to-day, and so, with the indulgence of my fellow-members, I will address myself, hurriedly and necessarily imperfectly, to the pending question.

One might wonder, at first impression, as to what is the reason for the legislation now proposed; from whence comes the call for its enactment. But if at all acquainted with the history of the country in recent times you would have no difficulty in answering the query. The call does not come from the great mass of the American people; it does not come from the level of American citizenship; not from the producing elements of the country; but it comes from those who hold the mortgage executed by the Republican party, for value received, in 1896—from those who have been clamorous for fulfillment of the promises then so lavishly made to them.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who was eloquent and interesting, as he always is upon every subject on which he speaks—Mr. DOLLIVER says that with gold so plentiful the money question has grown stale and unprofitable in his estimation. He says he thinks that in July, 1896, the general belief prevailed throughout the country that the forces which gave to the world the promise of a battle royal upon the lines drawn by the people at Chicago were sure to win. He tells us that as he then saw us rally around the standard of that magnificent specimen of manhood and democracy, William J. Bryan, of Nebraska [applause on the Democratic side], he thought we were about to sweep the country, and that victory was destined to perch upon the banner of that champion of the people. He says that but a short time afterwards, in the progress of the discussion of the money question which took place among the people of the country, enlightened by the politicians of his own party, the whole aspect of the question was changed, especially when a voice came to the people from Canton, Ohio, promulgating a doctrine just the reverse of that which Bryan and his friends preached.

My recollection is not the same as that of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. I think he is in error. My recollection is that owing to events, not necessary to discuss now, and which could not be treated properly in the very short time at my command, a very different condition of affairs then existed. The Republicans felt secure in their strength; thought themselves invincible; thought the victory theirs—the battle so one-sided as to be won even before it was fought.

It was not a change of opinion, brought about by reason and argument, as claimed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], that gave the victory of November, 1896, to his party; the battle was fought and won on an entirely different principle, and by other agencies.

Not ready to meet their opponents on the hustings, not prepared to discuss the momentous questions of the hour, man to man, with argument against argument, all the influences and agencies of concentrated wealth, the despotic power of employers in tyrannous control over the employed, were brought into play. The mechanic was threatened with the closing of the factory where he found work and wages. The man whose daily toil and its reward furnished daily subsistence for himself and his family was told he must face discharge and beggary if he did not support the cause which the gentleman from Iowa says was so abundantly sustained in argument. Out of the strong boxes, seldom opened at the call of distress, seldom opened when philanthropy and nobility of spirit are

abroad, from out of those strong boxes came great quantities of hoarded wealth, gathered by unjust laws and by the perversion and abuse of laws in themselves not wrong. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Frightened, scared, panic-stricken, your party mortgaged its soul and body, its present, past, and future, together with the substance of the people, in order to raise the means with which to overcome, not by the force of argument, not by right reason, not by an appeal to the nobler instincts of humanity, but by an appeal to all that is sordid, all that is selfish, all that is corrupt and tyrannical, the American manhood that followed the flag unfurled at Chicago. You gathered together the united influence of wealth and despotic control over the destinies of the many, and mortgaged yourselves and these United States to increase the hold of these classes upon the American public, if out of their abundant substance, if out of the storehouse of their vast power, aid would come and save you from the judgment and the ballots of the millions of unpurchased and untrammelled American citizens.

The appeal was not in vain. The mortgage can not be repudiated because the condition failed, because the consideration was lacking. You carried the election of 1896, not because you overbore us in the conflict of reason, not because you appealed to loftier sentiments of American manhood, or assured an expectant American public, looking only for what was right and just, that your policies were sounder and would bring more in fruition than ours, but because you had the corrupt and tremendous power of money, which you used unsparingly, and because you had the vast power of numerous corporations holding in control the destinies of thousands, aye, of millions, of toilers, and used that power without mercy. These powers, massed and gathered, won your victory of 1896, won it against a man who received in that election over a million votes more than were ever cast for anyone who battled in all the years past under the same standard that he bore. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Say what you can in glorification of that victory. If you are proud of it, we are doubly proud of the noble fight that we gave you, clean from start to finish. We were overborne, but we were not overborne in the field of logic. We were not overborne in the forum of morals. We were not carried down because you were right and because we were wrong, but because you summoned to your aid agencies mightier for the time being than the will of the unpurchased and the unpurchasable American citizens in opposition to you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And now you come to fulfill the conditions upon which you won. In the years past you have hesitated and delayed; you have equivocated and quibbled. In 1896 you appealed to the people by your platform and, in all the Western and Southern regions of the country, by tongue and pen, as bimetalists, better and truer than we were. You asserted that you were going to bring bimetalism, the free coinage of silver, not in what you denominated the reckless way in which we advocated it, but in a safe, sound, secure way. You would send your commissioners abroad, to all the nations of the earth; would gather into one great bond all bimetalists, theoretical and practical. Then the mints would be opened. Then free coinage would be established and be maintained upon a safe, sound, and secure basis. Were you honest then or did you seek to deceive the people? If you were dishonest then, what evidence have you that you are honest now? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If you were honest then, what evidence do you bring that you are right now? But three short years have elapsed since your platform was made, in which you declared for free silver coinage by international agreement, which you solemnly pledged yourselves to promote, and yet you are now advocating precisely what, in all the South and West, you then repelled with scorn. There could not then be found in those regions a corporal's guard of you who claimed to be anything else than bimetalists. You were "safe" bimetalists, "sound" bimetalists, "bimetalists by the right route," "bimetalists upon the solid ground," "bimetalists who were going to carry the country to the double standard, not with jolts and jars and backsliding and danger, but steadily and securely, there to remain while the ages should roll on."

Now you are going to put the country upon the gold standard. You say it has been upon the gold standard since 1834. In the convincing language of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], if not upon the gold standard in 1834, surely then from 1853; and if not upon the gold standard in 1853, then unquestionably upon it in 1873; and I suppose, if perchance not entirely and indisputably upon it in 1873, then most certainly upon it by your legislation of 1899. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If we are upon the gold standard and have been there, lo, these many years, do you suppose the people who hold the mortgage that you executed to secure the victory in 1896 have been clamoring merely for a shadow? Do they not know what they are asking, and have they no means of estimating what they will get? Do you impute to those people absolute idiocy? If they are to get nothing by this legislation, why do they ask it and why do you

give it, in discharge of your great obligation to them, for giving you the victory in 1896 by corruption and by terror and by threats?

But are you really doing nothing in this bill? Is this bill a mere gentle bit of play, a mere exhibition of ability to plaster upon the statute book something new? Is there nothing in it? The gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN], who has just delivered a most thoughtful address, has pointed out how you will be giving as a bonus—not perhaps as a bonus, for you promised it and were paid for giving it, but how you will be giving, all the same—to the holders of the obligations of the Government millions and millions of dollars, according to your own philosophy and declarations, and according to theirs, by the passage of this bill. Where is your right to do it? Where have you the warrant to place upon the American people an additional dime of burden without giving to them something in compensation for what you exact from them?

What right have you to put into the bonds of the United States now outstanding anything which will enable those who hold them, wherever dispersed the world over, to exact from the American taxpayer an additional farthing, or a farthing of one metal when he has the legal right to use another metal in payment? Where is your warrant or authority for it? Do you proclaim that you are going to create "confidence" in the Government while you boast of its credit? You have not the pitiful excuse that sufficed for the passage of the credit strengthening act of years ago, which for years and years worked hardship and wrong upon the people of this Union. You have no such pretense for this act. You say it does not matter whether the word "gold" is or is not in the bonds, whether issued or to be issued under this bill enacted into the law. But let me remind you, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] has done, that when you issued these bonds the people who were to buy them—the bond mongers—told you that if you would write the word "gold" in the bonds they would give you more for them and that they would bring more on the market. The Congress of the United States refused to authorize the issue of gold bonds. Every obligation of the United States may be lawfully paid with silver dollars.

The most reckless of you will not dare deny that every obligation of the Government is payable in coin, whether of gold or silver. We have the right under the Constitution and under the law, the right in morals, the right in the courts, the right in fairness to the people, to discharge all these obligations by paying in gold coin or silver coin, or both, as may be best for us, we deciding.

Now, then, you are proposing to give many millions of dollars to these bondholders, to give them not of your own substance, but of the substance of the people of the United States. You are proposing now, when expenditures are mountain high, swelling far above the loftiest level of extravagance and waste ever reached at any time in the past—you are proposing now, not to check these expenditures in the interest of economy, not to stay this waste, but to give millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars to those who hold the obligations of these United States of America which are to be met and discharged, principal and interest, from the toil and sacrifice and savings of our people—aye, often from what is necessary to feed and to clothe American men, women, and children.

By this innocent little bill this is to come to pass: All the obligations of the United States shall be discharged with gold, and then will be presented that beautiful spectacle—over the anticipation of which the gentleman from Iowa revels in blissful eloquence—when the creditor of the Government, approaching the Treasury of the United States, will have laid out for his inspection, to delight his hungry eyes and to increase the palpitation of his fluttering heart, the gold and the silver, and there he will be told, "Take your choice; one is just as good as the other, but the obligations are payable in gold, gold! gold!! The contract has been changed and changed in your favor. The option of the Government has been given away by the law of a profligate Congress. The option of the Government has been surrendered in payment of a party pledge and promise made years ago in order to carry an election which could not be carried by fair means. Take your choice, but the obligation is payable in gold!" How the gentleman from Iowa revels in the prospect, revels in the vision which spreads out before him, haunts him, perhaps, in his dreams of these money changers demanding gold for bonds payable in coin! The bonds are outstanding in every country and clime and are all provided for by existing law. It seems that the edict to change the contracts and the law has gone forth.

The Congress of the United States, by direction of the powers that control the dominant party, in pursuance of a pledge in the interest of the masters of the same party, is about to write "gold" into every contract existing, every contract to be made, public and private, thus adding greatly to the burdens of the masses of the people and donating to a privileged class, wherever its members may be, whether in this land or any land under the shining sun, the rich booty. Meanwhile the money question is no

longer of interest, you say, for eloquent and distinguished gentlemen like Mr. DOLLIVER find that it has palled upon the taste, has lost power over the imagination, and no longer holds the fancy of the fanciful.

By your bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue bonds at will. What more monstrous than to empower a single officer, not elected by the people even, but appointed by the President, to mortgage as often and as heavily as he shall please to do, and for no better or more urgent purpose than you disclose, all the men, women, and children and all the property in our great Republic, not only the persons and things in being, but millions of American citizens and billions of dollars worth of property yet to be!

By this same bill you make all debts, public and private, present and future, payable under existing law in "coin"—silver coin or gold coin—payable in gold coin alone. Why thus rob the public? Why thus rob the citizen in his private business affairs? Do you fancy you can do all this and escape the righteous vengeance which your misdeeds merit? May not the stern slogan of the voters, the inspired refrain of the ballots, be "Thou shalt not steal?"

The coin debts and obligations of to-day, both public and private, all the debts and moneyed obligations of all the to-morrows—you are determined to make "gold," the god of the Briton and your god by adoption, the exacting measurer of them all. Do not count too confidently upon popular toleration of such conduct.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says you will listen to our remarks, but will vote solidly for the gold standard, bond-issuing, national-bank trust bill. He says that in the Republican caucus not a vote was thrown against this policy or this bill. I wish to nail that where it is, because the day is not far distant when in many of the Congressional districts of the United States, if I do not miss my guess, Republican members of this House will be found giving as their excuse and apology and justification for voting against the interests of their constituents and for this bill the caucus edict of their party and their duty to party. They will plead that their caucus overruled them, and that after a struggle valiant but vain they accepted the verdict, as in Republican duty bound. Out of the mouth of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] let there be confutation and confusion to each one of these hypocrites and pretenders. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side].

Every one of you from the prairies of the West, from the mountain States, from the States of the far North, from the South—every one of you voted in your caucus for the policy which you are ready now to vote for in the House. Do not go back to your constituents and plead the "baby act," do not talk about the lofty Republican party to which you belong and whine that you, as a dutiful member of that party, and humble at that particular time, bowed in obedience to the edict of your caucus, submitted to the decree of wise men in council. Go bravely back if you can, go honestly at least, and say, "I voted for this policy in caucus and I stand by it." Do it if you dare, and then when the Fifty-seventh Congress is organized there will not preside in that chair a gentleman of your party faith. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

There is great trouble, it seems, with some matters that appear in the book written by Mr. Bryan following the election of 1896, and called "The First Battle." The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] invested in that book at a bargain, and if the gentleman from Iowa reads that book he will know more than the gentleman from Iowa has furnished us evidence that he now knows. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

There has been a large quantity of gold produced in the last two years, we are told; the silver chimera has vanished into thin air and no longer has any interest for some gentlemen.

Coming down to the mathematical precision of the statistician from Iowa—and in using the word "statistician" I do not reflect on the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] [laughter]—the statistician from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says that if the mints of the nation had been open to free coinage only about 150,000,000 silver dollars, the depreciated dollars, the 40-cent dollars, as the gentleman denominates them, would have been coined in three years and rolled out and put in circulation among the people, while wonders have been wrought, he says, during the beneficent reign of the amiable person to whose "little vine-clad porch at Canton, Ohio," were carried, at no expense to themselves, carloads and train loads of men, in order to affect the result of the election, by creating an appearance of unanimity concerning vine-clad porch sentiments. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Who does not know that mints are made with ease and that our mint capacity could be increased at will?

It was contended in 1896 that prices, in a general way, depend upon the quality of money available to measure the commodities sold and for sale. In 1899 the gentlemen on the other side indorsed that theory, by proclaiming that there is now no need of silver coinage; that now the gold standard may be firmly established, because there is a larger quantity of money in the country than there was before. Who was right in 1896 upon this point? The

gentleman from Iowa says that in 1896 there was great scarcity of money; that it was locked up and could not be had; that prices were low and times were hard. Money is abroad now, he says, and everything is prosperous, prosperity abounding, prosperity universal, the idle man, if industrious, something that can not be found, a vanished goblin of the past, a shadow that fitted before our vision, but is gone, leaving the beneficent radiance of McKinleyism absolutely unobscured. In 1896, I say, it was contended by those who rallied around the banner of William J. Bryan that when you increase the quantity of primary money in the country you increase the level of prices. In 1899 the gentlemen who then opposed that theory say the volume of money is increased, and prices are advanced, to the extent that it is not necessary to resort to silver coinage for more money; and now they are bold enough and expectant enough, in remembrance of favors past, to support the pending gold-standard bill.

You take credit for the discoveries in the Klondike. You put upon your own credit side of the ledger all that has been gathered from the golden sands of southern Africa. All that came from the wondrously rich mines of Cripple Creek you simply appropriate as either produced or brought to light by the direct agency of that little vine-clad porch in Canton, Ohio. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

How long is this outpouring of gold to continue? Can some of your wise men tell us what the rate of increase will be; what the rate of decrease? In the history of the world many times the world has thought that there was about to be a plethora of the precious metals. Not alone has it been thought in some quarters that silver would be too abundant. Only a short time back certain nations of the world, as you know, alarmed at the great discoveries of that metal in California and Australia, demonetized gold upon the ground that gold was going to become too plentiful to be useful for a money metal.

How long is the gold output to continue? Do you know? The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says that we were very much at fault in 1896 because no one could say precisely and absolutely what would be the effect of restored free silver coinage. We showed you by the light of history the ground of our hope and belief. We gave to you facts from the lips and the works of historians, living and dead, as to what had been done. We gave you the history of the centuries. We asked you to behold the landmarks of the ages. We said that what had been done through a long series of years, what transpired in the flight of the centuries, we believed could be made to happen again.

You are now in a place where you are to do some prophesying. How much gold is to be produced next year, and how much the year after, and how much the year after that? How much gold is necessary in this country? Has the level been reached? If not, when will it be reached? It would be like idle children playing upon the seashore, making marks in the sand to be obliterated, one after another, by each incoming wave, for you to enter upon that field of conjecture. All of history is against your proposition that gold is going to be produced in enormous quantities for any considerable period of time. But if it should be; if, contrary to all the experience of men, contrary to the reasonings which the facts of past ages give us, gold should be produced in vast quantities for a considerable period of time, those of you who survive the deluge that you are inviting, those of you who escape from the waters which you are about to let loose, and who return here when that condition of things exists, will be found loud and clamorous for stopping the coinage of gold.

I believe this country never has suffered, never will suffer, from a superabundance of good, sound legal-tender money. I am one of those who believe, and my reading of history sustains me in that belief, that the world never has known the day or the hour, nor man a country or section of a country or a spot in a country, where there has been real genuine suffering or hardship because of the existence of too much primary money, too much money of final redemption, too much money, the measure of all things that pass in the commercial world by purchase and sale. Do you know of such a country? If you do, enlighten those of us who do not, please, by giving us some of the facts in relation to it. I know and you know of times even in our own short experience—not to go beyond that, not to trust to the words of others, as found in history—you and I ourselves know of times of direst distress prevailing from shore to shore, aye, the universe over, on account of the scarcity of money; when prices went down and business was stagnant, when men suffered for bread and were clamoring for work, all because of the scarcity of primary money.

How do you know and how can you know that the world is about to produce, or that the world has produced, a surplus of the materials out of which to make solid and substantial full legal-tender gold and silver money? That period never existed in the history of the world. How do you know it has come now? How do you know it is to come? How do you know it is in the near future or in the future at all? You do not know; you are merely making good your pledge to the money mongers.

How can your legislation be in the interest of the great public?

Is it not in the interest of the masses of the people to have money cheap, as compared with commodities, in order that commodities as compared with money may be comparatively high?

"But," says the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], "prices have advanced; prices are high." And, pray, tell us how have they advanced? Some of you are associated with trusts. Some of you know that prices have advanced, and that the trusts have advanced them in many lines. Wire nails and barbed wire and thousands of other things have advanced in price. They have advanced mightily, as every man must know who is interested in the profits of their production; as every man must know who is interested in the trusts that control them; as every one of the plain thousands and millions of the men who are compelled to buy these articles of prime necessity is compelled to know. Prices of some things have advanced; prices of some things are higher. What made them so? In many instances the trusts did it; not because of increased cost of production; not because of increased wages to those who produced the articles; not because of increased prices to those who furnished the raw material, but by bold robbery on the part of those who have formed the trusts, under the shadow and protection of the very people who are ready now by this bill to form a more gigantic trust, the trust of trusts, the central trust, the trust around which all others are expected to revolve, and to which all others are expected to gravitate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They tell us that prosperity prevails everywhere. Is that true? Are there not special reasons for its existence where it is found? Is it universal? On the contrary, is it not a fact that right in this city property can be bought to-day, in the sunlight of this bogus McKinley prosperity, for less money than it would command two or three or five years ago? There is not a State in the western or southern part of our Union where a great deal of property, in town and country, can not be bought to-day for less money than would buy it but a few years ago. There has been so much talk about prosperity being all-pervading and abiding that I am reminded of the people who are said, by telling frequently a thing which is not true, telling it with unctious, finally to believe it themselves. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Prosperity has been proclaimed here and there and everywhere. You proclaimed that it would come, and now you insist that it has come; that it is universal. Let your answer come, as come it will, from the hearthstones and from the ballots of the plain people of the land.

How many things have happened to produce this sporadic prosperity, prosperity here and there in spots? If three-fourths of all the buildings in this magnificent city were suddenly to be destroyed, vast prosperity would ensue in the building business and in the supply of all the materials necessary to build. Everybody able to buy would be forced to buy to replace what the ravages of the destroying element had robbed him of. Those unable to buy would be compelled to give place to those who could buy. The demand for labor would be intense. The pressure for building supplies, for all things most useful in the reconstruction of a desolated city, would be unprecedented. Every man who desired employment could secure it, and the would-be employer would not higgie with him as to the wages which he should receive. Would that be prosperity—making good again what had been lost, repairing the damage of the fire or flood or cyclone?

Gentlemen may forget that for some months this country has been at war. They may forget that a large share of the young men of the land went to Cuba and Porto Rico; that now many are in the distant Philippine Islands. They may forget that for months many thousands of these young men were detained in camps in this country, ready for departure to the seat of war, withdrawn from the active pursuits of life, consumers and no longer producers. You may recollect that there was an extraordinarily increased demand, an imperative demand, which had to be met at once, for all the various things necessary to equip and supply and sustain an army.

Munitions of war, clothing, food, means of transportation, were all in great demand. What could be the effect of all that but to increase activity in very many lines and, for the time being, to increase prosperity in all the avenues of trade, business, and manufacture into which that strongly imperative call went? Where is the evidence of prosperity outside of that? Where is the general building up, the general advancement, except that which comes from special reasons, easily traceable to causes which are temporary, which must pass with the events that called them into being? Be not too sure that while you prattle about prosperity, with wild speculators and reckless speculation all about you, the deep fires of a volcano which you fancy is extinct may not break forth suddenly, to spread financial panic and ruin far and wide.

One of the things that you propose to do in this bill is to take in and retire the greenbacks. How many of you who come from the States of the West, how many of you who have prated about the greenback being the creature of the Republican party and about the Republican party being its best friend, how many of you who

have won your seats here by proclaiming love for that sainted money of the civil war, how many of you are going back to your constituents to admit that you, in caucus and in the councils of your own party, voted for and advocated the measure which takes in and destroys the greenback?

It will not do to say to me that you will pay out the greenbacks again. The object of your legislation is to take them in and give power to the Secretary of the Treasury to divert them from the channels of trade, to keep them from the people of these United States.

The silver dollars which you are going to redeem in gold are dollars in which every obligation of the Government may be paid. We know, and pardon us if we believe you must know, that you will grievously wrong American manhood when you make standard silver dollars—half a billion of them nearly—redeemable in gold. You are unmindful of your duty to the masses, the people of the United States, whose support you got in part by means that were corrupt and by coercion that was odious and un-American. Worse still, you are betraying the people, who regarded you as sincere in your declaration that you really did look to the welfare of the masses of American citizens and would be mindful of them when you could do your will here, and therefore supported you.

It is a huge bank trust which you are to create. The gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] thinks it will fail, because, he thinks, you are not offering sufficient inducement to the bondholders to tempt them to embark in the banking business. They think your legislation will enhance the value of the bonds by making them payable in gold, and you are depriving your countrymen of the right to use the silver half of the money of the country in paying them. Your scheme, however successful in the pockets and the minds of those who presented it, will be a bitter disappointment in its realization to the plain Republicans, who, forgotten by you, may forget you in turn or hold you in remembrance for deserved punishment.

You expect that a bank syndicate in the seat of financial empire in this country will be the sun of your new system and that around it will revolve as satellites the lesser banks. With a bank trust, mighty, far-reaching, almost omnipotent in financial affairs; with your other trusts, which you have created and foster in the interest of the Republican party, you may think you will be absolutely secure. It may be so. The special class to whom you appealed in 1896 see that their confidence was not misplaced, but are you secure, after all, in disregarding the interests and the rights of American citizenship? Will there not rise up against you in judgment your own words, speeches, platforms, and promises to the masses? The gentleman from Iowa says he does not care anything about that. He says he is not going to be held to what he did; not going to be held to what he said. [Applause.] Forgetful of what you said to your plain Republican constituents, indifferent as to them, you are keeping faith with the plutocratic mortgagees as if they alone gave you victory.

You say you are going to put this bill through by a unanimous Republican vote. You have taken your orders. The gentleman from Iowa says it has been whispered that they have taken their orders upon that side. The gentleman from Iowa says he has taken his orders—taken them from the farmers of the district in Iowa which he represents. Did those farmers call upon you to retire from their use, and the use of the American people, the greenbacks which you have lauded so many times and of which, though you were not the father, you have certainly made yourself, by speech, the step-father? [Laughter.] Did they call upon you for legislation to destroy the silver dollar with which they transact their business and pay their taxes and debts? You are acting under orders, but you pretend to misunderstand the source of those orders. They come from elsewhere than the farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill is your remedy for evils, when you say there are none. This is an assurance for the future, which you say is already assured us. You are following in the way blazed by Old England. You are in line with the English system, but not in one thing alone. Why, lately you have put yourselves in closer touch with England and sympathize with her in her schemes of spoliation. Only in individual cases do you sympathize with the Boers of South Africa in their struggle for liberty against that country which smothered liberty in Ireland and has struck it down in every quarter of the globe. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

You are abandoning the aspirations of the people of these United States to be free themselves and to help others to freedom, aspirations as lofty and as noble as any that ever inspired man since the morning stars sang together. We were once a liberty-loving, liberty-respecting nation. We were an inspiration and an encouragement to other people. Now your sympathies are with those who are trying to crush out liberty and your proudest boast is that you are engaged in the business yourselves. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

You may think that everything is bright for you. You may think that 1900 can have no fears for you; that the battle is already

won. But recollect that the approval of those who can be bought by partial legislation may not compensate you for the loss of others who have followed your standard from a devotion to principle which they thought you shared with them and who will not follow you when convinced that those principles no longer animate you, if they ever did. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

Do not count too securely upon the result in 1900. Recollect there will be gathered against you then men not drawn together under "orders," but coming as volunteers; men battling for homes and principles and liberty; men waging the fight that was waged in this country more than once in the century past; men standing upon principles proclaimed, defended, and illustrated by the bravest and best Americans that ever trod American soil. They will be there as volunteers; they will come from the farms and the shops, from the hills and from the valleys; and it will be a mighty host. Against them you may throw successfully your cohorts purchased by payment actually made and promises of things to be done, and then again you may not.

I have great reliance in American manhood when once aroused. Do not think that this defiance of their rights, this throwing to the winds of your own promises and your own professions, this legislation for classes against the masses, this iniquitous measure, will go unchallenged. Money again will be talked about at the fireside. Men will be gathered upon the street corners again. Again they will be making the gestures that the gentleman from Iowa made so artistically. Again the plain people will be found in conversation, in discussion; and these little groups, let me warn you, will assemble East and West and North and South, and great meetings will grow from them; and they will not assemble to praise or thank you. You may find that all the British friendship you have gathered in your endeavor to ingratiate yourself with the old "mother" who tried to strangle us in our infancy [laughter on the Democratic side], to assassinate us in the days of our youth, and who now, through you, is using us may fall short of your needs.

All the help you can get from corporations, with all the power of the money which you give them out of the people's purse, expecting that a goodly portion of it will be used for your benefit—all this superadded may not be enough. We will appeal to American manhood, to American patriotism. We will have again abroad in this land a spirit of inquiry and earnest discussion. Do not flatter yourselves that when the great conflict of 1900 is on we shall not be heard from; and let me warn you that when the battle is fought and the victory won it may not be necessary to go to the White House or to the "vine-clad cottage" at Canton, Ohio, with congratulations, but across the mighty Mississippi and over the prairies of the great West to a modest little home in Lincoln, Nebr. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House bill No. 1 "to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes," and had come to no resolution thereon.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to have printed and bound all documents for use of said committee that it may deem necessary in connection with subjects in relation to appropriations being considered, or to be considered, by the said committee during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present for reference to the appropriate committee, when organized, a certain concurrent resolution of the State of Texas, requesting the calling of a constitutional convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States when a sufficient number of States shall concur therein. Inasmuch as this is a matter of some importance, I wish to ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. And not for reference to a committee?

Mr. LANHAM. And to be referred to the appropriate committee when appointed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas requests that the resolution be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House. Is there any objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution, S. C. R. No. 4.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America provided that Congress, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments to said Constitution: Therefore, we, the senate of the State of Texas, the house of representatives of the State of Texas concurring, do hereby petition and request the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for proposing amendments to said Constitution as soon as the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States of the United States of America shall concur in this resolution by applying to Congress to call said convention.

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and is hereby, directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Congressmen from Texas, and to the governor of each State at once, and to the legislatures of the several States as they convene, with a request of them to concur with us in this resolution.

D. H. HARDY, Secretary of State.

Approved June 5, 1899.

COMMERCIAL ATTACHÉS TO EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, a communication from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, inclosing resolutions unanimously adopted by that chamber on June 1, 1899, requesting legislation authorizing the appointment of commercial attachés to the principal embassies and legations of the United States.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, December 11, 1899.

NORWEGIAN STEAMSHIP NICARAGUA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-fifth Congress, a report from the Secretary of State, and accompanying papers, relating to the appeal for indemnity addressed to the equitable consideration of the Government of the United States by the owners and late master of the Norwegian steamship *Nicaragua*.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, December 11, 1899.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Printing:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit a communication from the Secretary of State, inclosing the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of the American Republics, with accompanying documents.

The attention of Congress is called to the request of the Secretary of State that 2,500 copies of the report be printed for the use of the Bureau.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, December 11, 1899.

NORWEGIAN STEAMSHIP ALBERT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-fifth Congress, a report from the Secretary of State, and accompanying papers, relating to the claim of Capt. B. Telefsen, of the Norwegian steamer *Albert*, against the Government of the United States for \$998.96, being the expenses incurred by him in consequence of a violation of article 13 of the treaty of commerce and navigation of 1827 between the United States and Sweden and Norway.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, December 11, 1899.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine, indefinitely, on account of important business.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ERMENROUT.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have been delegated by the Congressional delegation from my State to announce the death of Hon. DANIEL ERMENROUT, a Representative from the Ninth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, which took place on the 17th of September. He was a member of the Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-fifth Congresses.

I move the adoption of the resolutions I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolutions will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. DANIEL ERMENROUT, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to unanimously; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the commissioners to revise and amend the statutes relating to patents, trade and other marks, and trade and commercial names, transmitting a preliminary report—to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Tonawanda Harbor and Creek, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Bass River Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the banks of the Ohio River at or near New Liberty, in Pope County, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Cottage City, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of a channel from Lake Michigan to Stony Lake, Oceana County, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Two Islands or Saxton, Minn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the Ohio River bank from Mound City to Cairo, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Sandwich Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Winthrop Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of a canal in the Colorado River, in Matagorda County, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Patchogue River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification—to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Attorney-General submitting certain estimates of deficiency appropriations—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, referring to Congress the subject of the alleged deficiency in the *Virginus* indemnity fund—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a special estimate of appropriation for observation of eclipse of the sun of May 28, 1900—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the findings of the Comptroller of the Treasury in the case of P. S. Corbett—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department requesting an additional allowance for the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, computers, accountants, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the report of a board of visitors to the United States Naval Observatory for the year 1899, with a favorable recommendation of its contents—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Quartermaster-General of the Army, calling attention to the necessity of continuing the suspension of provisions of the act of June 7, 1898—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy

of a communication from the Treasurer of the United States, submitting petitions from the compositors and from pressmen in his office for an advance in their pay—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the custodian of dies, rolls, and plates, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, in relation to an increase of the salaries of the custodian and his force and a change in the designation of the employees—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the commissioner of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company, transmitting the annual report for the year ended December 2, 1899—to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, relating to the purchase of the Gerdon patent gas check—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting letters from the Quartermaster-General and Surgeon-General of the Army calling attention to the urgent necessity for continuing the suspension of the provision of the law for the examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and officers of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the petition of Joshua Bishop, commander, United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Jacob B. Carwell against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Augustus S. Shaver, administrator of James Mathews, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Josephine Andersen, administratrix of Thomas Andersen, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Sarah R. Maclin, for herself and as administratrix of Benjamin P. Maclin, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Nancy H. Beans and Rebecca H. Beans, executrices of Isaiah B. Beans, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of I. A. McSpadden, administrator of Cyrus A. Humphries, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Charles Posey against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of David L. Harris, administrator of Leah Bray, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William B. Fleeman against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Charles M. Wells, administrator of Martha L. Wells, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. T. Lynch, administrator of Henderson Lynch, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of White B. Campbell, administrator of James Campbell, deceased, and others, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John

Young against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of J. D. Sanders, administrator of Isaiah Sweat, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John Beets, administrator of George W. Beets, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Isaac W. Lewis against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Hugh N. Kirby, administrator of James Bundren, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of G. M. Barber against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of preliminary examination of Arcadia, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Isaac Young against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3330) providing for construction of a Pacific cable—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 3331) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newcastle, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 3332) for the construction of a public building at Owosso, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 3333) to regulate the use of the contingent fund of the House in the payment of the funeral expenses of deceased members—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3334) to amend section 3005 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 3335) for the erection of a new public building at Burlington, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 3336) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Cordele, in the State of Georgia, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) for the erection of a public building at the city of Hawkinsville, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3338) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fort Valley, in the State of Georgia, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3339) for the improvement of the Ocmulgee River, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 3340) for the erection of a public building at Baraboo, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3341) relating to widows' pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 3342) to open a street through block 205, from Fourteenth street to Fifteenth street NW., concurrent with the streets in the adjacent blocks called "Wallach place" and "Caroline street," and so forth—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3343) to regulate the service and fix the hours of service for persons employed as policemen, firemen, and officers in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3344) to divide the State of Washington into two judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3345) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lawrence, Kans.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 3346) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Mason City, Iowa, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3347) making appropriation for continuing improvement of Pearl River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 3348) to repeal the duty on wood pulp and all other material used in the manufacture of printing papers and writing papers, and to reduce the duty on manufactured printing papers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3349) concerning the naming of naval vessels after States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 3350) for the establishment of a military post at the Falls of the Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3351) to provide an American register for the steamer *Esther*, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3352) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to increase the pension of pensioners on attaining the age of 64 years—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 3353) to establish a postal savings depository system and to provide for the conduct and regulation of the same—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3354) for a public building for a marine hospital at Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN (by request): A bill (H. R. 3355) to enable Indians to obtain patents for their lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 3356) to enforce certain contracts entered into between citizens of the United States and the Indians of the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3357) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Corsicana, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) to provide for the erection of an addition to the United States post-office in the city of Dallas, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) to limit the jurisdiction of the district and circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) to establish a branch of the United States circuit and district courts for the northern district of Texas at the city of Corsicana—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3361) to prohibit the payment of anything for expenses in election-contest cases, and to repeal all laws allowing expenses for the same—to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3362) to create a permanent reservation on Annette Island, southeastern Alaska, for the use of the Metlakatla Indians and other natives of Alaska—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 3363) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stones River—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3364) to establish the compensation for the collector of customs for the district of Richmond, Va.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 3365) to extend and make flexible national-bank currency, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 3366) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) to restore the rights of certain militiamen, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions on account of gunshot wounds received in the service in the line of duty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3369) to put in force in the Indian Territory certain provisions of the laws of Arkansas relating to corporations,

and to make said provisions applicable to said Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) in regard to the employment of ex-Union soldiers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3371) pensioning the widow of one who served as an officer or enlisted man in the military or naval service of the United States, and who was permanently disabled by the loss of a limb in battle, granting to the widow the same rate of pension as was granted to her husband in his lifetime—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3372) providing for authority to copy the muster rolls of Confederate armies—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3373) providing for the extension of the national cemetery, on the Williamsburg turnpike, near the city of Richmond, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 3374) for the establishment of a light-house at the mouth of Oyster Bayou, near the Louisiana coast, in the Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 3375) to increase the pension of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 3458) for the relief of certain State militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 3506) to provide for the erection of a monument for Joseph Anthony Mower—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3533) to reimburse the depositors of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company for losses incurred by the failure of said company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE (by request): A bill (H. R. 3597) to incorporate the Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 3701) to restore to certain citizens the proceeds arising from the sale of their lands under the several acts levying direct taxes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3715) to place officers of the Army upon the same footing as regards retirement with officers of the Navy, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) for the erection of a public building at Marblehead, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy and polygamous cohabitation within the bounds of a State or Territory of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) authorizing the printing of the report of the Nicaraguan Canal Commission—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PAYNE: A resolution (H. Res. 32) requesting the Superintendent of Documents to furnish the House with certain copies of the Revised Statutes and supplement—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULL: A resolution (H. Res. 33) authorizing the Committee on Accounts to designate committees to which session clerks should be assigned—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DE GRAFFENREID: A resolution (H. Res. 34) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish statement of all contracts for river and harbor improvements entered into since May 12, 1898—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LENTZ: A resolution (H. Res. 35) proposing to extend the authority of the special committee authorized to investigate the right of B. H. Roberts to a seat in the House to also investigate certain postmasters in the State of Utah as to their eligibility to hold office—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWERS: A resolution (H. Res. 36) for the appointment of a special messenger in and about the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A resolution (H. Res. 37) to cause survey and estimate of cost of deepening and widening channel leading to and along harbor front, Sandusky, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JETT: A resolution (H. Res. 39) relative to the heroic struggles of the people of the South African Republic against cruelty and oppression—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Connecticut, concerning the naming of a battle ship *Connecticut*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relating to a proposed amendment to the Constitution giving Congress authority to establish uniform hours of labor in manufactories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3376) for the relief of Franklin Lee and Charles F. Dunbar—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) for the relief of William F. Wheeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) authorizing the Secretary of War to certify Frank D. White, late corporal, Company 1, Two hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteers, for a position in the civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 3379) for the relief of Mrs. A. C. Wagner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 3380) for the relief of the estate of Owen Conlen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3381) for the relief of the estate of Naphtalia Solomon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) for the relief of Eugene Augustin Bourcy, of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) for the relief of Auguste Alvarado, of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) for the relief of Edgar Breaux, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) for the relief of Zachine Dugat, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3386) for the relief of Balisaire Cormier, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3387) for the relief of Mary M. Hopkins, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3388) for the relief of Susan L. Bailey, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3389) for the relief of estate of Louisa Breaux, deceased, late of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Riu, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) for the relief of Corrinne Perrett Fusilier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3392) for the relief of John Ellis, of Vermilion Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3393) for the relief of the estate of Jean Crouchet, deceased, late of New Iberia Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3394) for the relief of estate of Jean Constantin, deceased, late of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) for the relief of estate of Mrs. Celestine Vavasseur, deceased, late of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3396) for the relief of the estate of John A. Rigues, deceased, late of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3397) for the relief of George Henderson, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3398) for the relief of Valvien Martin, of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3399) for the relief of J. M. Charpentier, of St. Mary Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3400) for the relief of Natalie Bondrean, Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3401) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Hilbert, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3402) for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Slack, deceased, late of Iberville Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3403) for the relief of Bennett Lilly, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) for the relief of P. Emile Arceneaux, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3405) for the relief of William Gucherean, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3406) for the relief of the estate of Charles Armelin, deceased, late of St. Mary Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) for the relief of Louis Broussard, of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) for the relief of Louis Hymelle, of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3409) for the relief of Augustin Broussard, of Vermilion Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3410) for the relief of Arvillien Broussard, of Vermilion Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 3411) for the relief of R. P. Mitchell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) for the relief of John E. Barrett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3413) to grant a pension to Nancy Dillard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) to grant a pension to J. S. Grubb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3415) for the relief of Samuel Greenlee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) for the relief of Wiley Cazart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) to correct the military record of Isaac McQuinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3418) for the relief of Solomon B. Tucker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) to grant a pension to Mrs. Lucinda Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3420) for the relief of Silas J. Grenade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) for the relief of William M. Cox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) for the relief of C. C. Speers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) for the relief of Henry P. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3424) for the relief of Newton Gray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 3425) for the relief of E. W. and A. Cross, of Wakefield, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3426) granting an honorable discharge to Jesse Dotts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) granting a pension to Florence E. Wilbur, of Lawrence, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) granting a pension to Emmet Gillooly, of Humboldt, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) granting a pension to Mary McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3430) granting a pension to William H. Deesler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) granting a pension to A. M. Templer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) granting a pension to Joseph Fipps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) for the relief of the University of Kansas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3434) for the relief of the New England Distilling Company, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) for the relief of L. H. Lyne & Co., late of Lynchburg, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3436) for the relief of John Abel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 3437) granting a pension to Elam Kirk—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3438) to correct the naval record of Joseph Pitt, alias Joseph Marr, of the United States steamers *Princeton* and *Sassaicus*, and to erase the name of Joseph Marr and substitute the name of Joseph Pitt on the records of the United States Army—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) for the relief of the legal devisees of James W. Schaumberg—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3440) for the relief of George W. Hale—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) to correct the record of Stephen W. Coakley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 3442) granting a pension to Mary E. Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 3443) for the relief of Peter, alias Louis, Heck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3444) granting a pension to William G. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) for the relief of J. Ware Butterfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Judd, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3447) for the relief of L. H. Boyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) for the relief of Hiram B. Hatten—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3449) for the relief of Uriah Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3450) for the relief of William W. Burritt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3451) granting a pension to William Crossland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3452) for the relief of Regina Mayer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3453) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Mulvane, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) granting a pension to Joseph E. Baldwin, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3455) granting a pension to Henry K. Wiggins, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3456) granting a pension to John W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3457) granting a pension to George Reynolds, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3459) for the relief of Miss Lou Jahn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3460) for the relief of Oliver J. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3461) granting a pension to George M. Horning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3462) for the relief of J. W. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3463) to pension Mrs. Catharine Shipley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3464) for the relief of John H. Tullis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3465) for the relief of Jerome Kunkel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3466) for the relief of Hiram Stimple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 3467) granting a pension to Isaac Willingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3468) granting a pension to Turner J. Bowling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3469) granting a pension to George W. De Wald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 3470) granting an increase of pension to Capt. George W. Weeden, of Olneyville, R. I.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 3471) for the relief of John Edenburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 3472) for the relief of Timothy Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3473) for the relief of Samuel Sentenne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3474) for the relief of John W. Vandine, of Halls Mills, Wetzel County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3475) to grant a pension to William W. Freeman, of Zinnia, Doddridge County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3476) to grant a pension to Jacob Hare, of New Cumberland, Hancock County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3477) to grant a pension to Willis Mollohan, of Caress, Braxton County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) granting a pension to J. A. J. Lightburn, Lewis County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) for the relief of John J. Robinson, of Endicott, Wetzel County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 3480) for the relief of John McGovern—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) granting a pension to Josephine A. Haley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 3482) for the relief of the vestry and church wardens of the Episcopal Church of the parish of St. Helena, in the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) for the relief of Mrs. Jane A. Sanders, widow of Edward W. Sanders, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 3484) for the relief of Thomas Bumstead, late of Company A, Fifty-first Wisconsin Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN (by request): A bill (H. R. 3485) to correct and amend the military record of Stephen Helton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3486) to relieve John Friedlin from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 3487) to pension Solomon Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) for the relief of the First Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Point Pleasant, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3489) to pension William H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3490) granting a pension to Freeman H. Farr—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3491) granting a pension to Melvina Greenawalt, widow of Abraham Greenawalt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3492) to correct the record of Isaac Kase, late Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, by removing the charge of desertion from the same—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3493) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Morse, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 3494) granting a pension to Nancy C. Tenant, widow of Samuel F. Tenant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to Levi G. Wilgus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3496) to pension John R. Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3497) for the relief of the estate of S. N. Clark, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3498) for the relief of the Roman Catholic Church of St. Peter's, at Jackson, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nancy Mitchell, of Lincoln County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3500) for the relief of William M. Dotson, alias William M. Isley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), a bill (H. R. 3501) to pension Mrs. A. J. Bassett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) for the relief of the estate of W. W. Dunton, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) for the relief of Mattie J. and W. P. Horn, heirs of Preston A. Horn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) for the relief of Mrs. Rachael Vining—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 3505) for the relief of Louise Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 3507) granting a pension to Emily J. Stowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3508) granting a pension to Mary Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3509) for the increase of pension of Farnham J. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 3510) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Kulage, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 3511) to inspect and correct the accounts of certain employees of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3512) to pension Rebecca G. Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 3513) awarding a pension of \$50 per month to Edwin Hurlburt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. M. A. C. Kaigler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) for the relief of George H. Sieg, a citizen of Americus, Sumter County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3516) for the relief of J. W. Holmes, a citizen of Americus, Sumter County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3517) granting an increase of pension to Marx Kunz, sr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) granting an increase of pension to John H. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) granting a pension to Leander F. McCoy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) granting a pension to Adaline Simons—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3521) for the relief of heirs of J. H. Dibble—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of Lucy S. Bane—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3523) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas W. Brewer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) granting a pension to Fannie W. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) for relief of Mary Diamond—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3526) granting a pension to James M. Ellett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3528) for the relief of Louisa B. Blair—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3529) granting a pension to M. E. P. Bennett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) granting a pension to M. A. Lucy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3531) to authorize the Light-House Board to pay to Chamblin, Delaney & Scott the sum of \$2,125—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Ayers, of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3534) granting a pension to Alfred Le Valley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) granting an increase of pension to William Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3536) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ridenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3537) for the relief of Morton A. Pratt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3538) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 3539) granting an increase of pension to John H. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) authorizing the placing of the name of Joseph Hooker Wood upon the retired list of the United States Army with the rank of lieutenant-colonel of cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 3541) for the relief of George Humphrey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3542) granting an honorable discharge to James B. Mulford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Janes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 3544) to remove charge of desertion from the record of Charles Sandford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3545) granting a pension to Mrs. Ellen Hardin Walworth—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3546) granting a pension to Caroline M. H. Searing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3547) for the relief of John A. Whitman, a blind soldier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 3548) for the relief of W. R. Austin & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 3549) granting a pension to Ransom L. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3550) for increase of pension of Henry W. Holden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3551) for increase of pension of William A. Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3552) for the relief of Daniel J. Ockerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3553) granting a pension to Watson Empson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) granting an increase of pension to Barnabas A. Bonham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) granting the Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and determine Thomas Page's claim for Indian depredation—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3556) for increase of pension of Barton S. Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) for the relief of Mrs. M. E. Halderman, widow of Francis Halderman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3558) to correct the military record of James Owens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3559) granting George W. Wicks and his two children land in lieu of allotments and of annuities—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3560) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased, of the parish of Orleans, La.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3561) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3562) granting a pension to Mary Jane McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3563) to grant a pension to T. Gilbert Floyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) granting a pension to Nancy Ellen Besom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) granting a pension to Johanna E. O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 3566) granting a pension to Louisa Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) for the relief of Charles E. French—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3568) granting a pension to Sarah Maley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 3569) granting a pension to Mary Idle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3570) for the relief of Cyrus E. Salada—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) granting a pension to George W. Lehman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3572) for the relief of Samuel Feevy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3573) for the relief of Elizabeth Weaver, dependent mother of William H. Weaver, late captain of Company D, Twelfth Pennsylvania Reserves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of Jane E. Wox, widow of Anthony Wox, late private, Company K, Two hundred and tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to William C. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3576) granting a pension to Emma Handshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3577) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to correct the military record of Levi Sheetz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3578) granting an increase of pension to John Sweesy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3579) granting a pension to Martin P. Schaffner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3580) granting a pension to Kate E. Keiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) for the relief of David B. Zorger and H. C. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3582) for the relief of the heirs of Margaretta D. Fenn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3583) granting a pension to Abram Heckenborn, of Harrisburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3584) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Neidinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3585) to remove the charge of desertion against John P. Leitzel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3586) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Francis Tomlinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3587) for the removal of the charge of desertion standing against the name of John Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) to correct the military record of Lieut. John W. Geiger, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3589) for the removal of the charge of desertion standing against the name of John Brininger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) to correct the military record of John F. Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) to correct the military record of Joseph Betz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3592) to correct the military record of John F. Geist—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 3593) authorizing the President to place the names of Julius R. Frederick, Henry Biederbick, Francis Long, and Maurice Campbell on the retired list with the rank, pay, and allowance of first-class sergeants of the Signal Corps of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 3594) for the relief of E. H. Murrell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 3595) for the relief of Elizabeth Thomas, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3596) for the relief of Elizabeth Thomas, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3598) to enable the President to restore Second Lieut. Henry Ossian Flipper to duty, rank, and status in United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3599) for the relief of Lewis M. Millard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 3600) for the relief of the heirs of Ann H. Shaler, of Campbell County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 3601) removing the charge of

desertion from the military record of Nathaniel Tillotson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) correcting the military record of Zebulon A. Cornell, alias James Cromwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 3603) for the relief of Isaiah Berdine, Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) for the relief of the trustees of the Waterford Baptist Church, Waterford, Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3605) for the relief of the trustees of Broad Run Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3606) for the relief of Martha F. Rixey, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3607) for the relief of George A. Nowland, administrator of James B. Beaver, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3608) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Crump, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3609) to grant pension to Agnes B. Hoffman, as widow of William G. Hoffman, late first lieutenant Third United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 3610) for the relief of Thomas M. Emerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3611) for the relief of Joseph H. Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3612) for the relief of C. C. Lowe, of Rutherford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3613) for the relief of Dobson Johnson, of DeKalb County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3614) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Fayetteville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3615) for the relief of J. M. Carney, of Franklin County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3616) for the relief of Barclay M. Tillman, of Bedford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) for the relief of William F. Cowan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) authorizing the heirs of Benjamin Lillard, of Tennessee, to present their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3619) to pay the heirs of Benjamin Lillard, of Tennessee, for property lost, destroyed, taken, and used by the United States forces during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3620) authorizing Musadora, Victoria, Ella, and Frank Wasson, of Tennessee, to present their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3621) granting a pension to James M. O'Neal, soldier of Indian war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3622) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jordon H. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3623) for the relief of L. D. Sugg, of Lincoln County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) for the relief of J. H. Blackburn, Dwelltown, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3625) granting a pension to Tempier Goodson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) for the relief of James C. Hoover, of Rutherford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 3627) granting an increase of pension to Freeman C. Stanton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3628) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Taylor Dodge—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3629) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Redding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3630) granting a pension to Annie W. Coit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3631) to correct the military record of Edwin T. Leach—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) to correct the military record of Charles H. Hawley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 3633) for the relief of H. Clay Hall—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3634) to amend the military record of Sylvester W. Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Timothy B. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) granting an increase of pension to George A. Libby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3637) to increase the pension of Ellen C. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 3638) granting an increase of pension to John G. W. Book—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3639) to increase the pension of James Graham, a veteran of two wars—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) granting a pension to Mary Pollock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Lavine, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-ninth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) to correct the military record of John B. Dininger, late of Company D, Eighty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3644) appropriating \$300 to Peter Fennell, late of Company H, One hundred and ninety-ninth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3645) appropriating \$100 to John M. Turner, of Butler, Pa., late of Company E, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3646) for the relief of William Chilton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3647) for the relief of Calvin R. Rutherford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 3648) to increase the pension of Charles W. Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3649) to increase the pension of William Percival—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) to pension Eliza Wilson, mother of Clark L. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 3651) placing James W. Long, late a captain, United States Army, on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) to renew certain letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A bill (H. R. 3653) for the relief of Willis Cromwell, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3654) for the relief of Calvin Myers, of Overton County, Tenn., a soldier in the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3655) granting a pension to Mrs. Margaret Burns, as widow of Peter Burns, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3656) granting a pension to Mary A. Beauchat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3657) granting a pension to Elizabeth Mayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3658) granting a pension to Catherine Broughton, dependent mother—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3659) granting a pension to L. Emma Boone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) granting a pension to Franklin I. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) restoring to the pension rolls the name of Mary A. Rusher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) granting a pension to John D. Lindsay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3663) to authorize the payment of commutation to David Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Metzger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3665) granting an honorable discharge to Elias May—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3666) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Longacre—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) granting an honorable discharge to David Clancy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of William W. Crissinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) granting an honorable discharge to David Harrington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3670) granting an honorable discharge to William Hartzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3671) granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin F. Hildenbittle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3672) granting an honorable discharge to James Ammerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3673) granting an honorable discharge to George G. Patterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3674) granting an honorable discharge to Joseph Price—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3675) granting an honorable discharge to Frank H. Sefton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3676) granting an honorable discharge to William Sinclair—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Thorn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) granting an honorable discharge to John B. Hosteau—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) granting an honorable discharge to Phillip Kurtz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3680) granting an honorable discharge to Archie Downey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob S. Wedley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3682) granting an honorable discharge to David J. Albaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) granting an honorable discharge to Henry Wernet—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3684) granting an honorable discharge to William Kynett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3685) granting an honorable discharge to Mathew Healy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3686) granting an honorable discharge to James Boyle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) granting a pension to Julia Yates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3688) granting a pension to William Embley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) granting pension to Daniel L. Saeger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) extending the term of patent No. 227024—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3691) granting a pension to Thomas Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3692) to fix the status of certain officers of the Army and Navy at time of their discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Sanford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) granting an increase of pension to James Bottoms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER (by request): A bill (H. R. 3695) for a pension for James E. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 3696) for the relief of Mary R. Frost—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3697) for relief of estate of John Dear, deceased, of Attala County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3698) for the relief of the legal representatives of Benjamin Roach, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of John Willis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 3700) to increase the pension of Frank Podom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 3702) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Wolfey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3703) granting an increase of pension to Ellis P. Phipps, late lieutenant of Company A, Twelfth New Jersey Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 3704) granting a pension to Bridget A. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 3705) granting a pension to Almada Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of Jerry S. Fish, of Cameron, Marshall County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) for the relief of William D. Anderson, of Walkersville, Lewis County, W. Va., late private of Company A, Tenth West Virginia Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) to pension Asa Moneypenny, of Cox Mill, Gilmer County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3709) to pension Hiram Rollins, of West Union, Doddridge County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3710) granting a pension to William H. Sehon, of Harrison County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) for the relief of Henry P. McMasters, late private of Company F, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) for the relief of Jacob W. Hudson, of Weston, Lewis County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3713) for the relief of Michael Shepherd, of Halls Mills, Wetzel County, W. Va., late private of Company D, Forty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) for the relief of Felix H. Hunicke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson*; of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgson, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORLISS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson*; of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgson, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petitions of numerous citizens, churches, and societies in the counties of Fayette, Washington, and Greene, State of Pennsylvania, in opposition to the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petitions of citizens of Heard County, Ga., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petitions of citizens of the Thirty-third Congressional district of New York, and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Buffalo, opposing the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, C. W. Wachter, A. L. Prouty, and other citizens of the Third Congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: Petition of H. L. Tripp and 22 other citizens of Oneida, Kans., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Lois A. Steele and others, of Brown County, Kans., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BARNEY: Petition of citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Wisconsin, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolution of the Turnvereins of the Chicago district, in relation to the Philippine war—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: Petitions of citizens of Pueblo, Colo., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of members of the State committee of the Evangelical Alliance of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BOREING: Petition of citizens of Leslie, Ky., favoring constitutional amendment defining marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Wayne and Monroe counties, Ky., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of George E. Lake and other citizens of Island Falls, Me., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BRENNER: Protests of Rev. Henry Crumpton and other citizens of the Third Congressional district of Ohio, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BROWN: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petitions of citizens of South Dakota, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Texas, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petitions of certain churches, synods, and citizens of the First Congressional district of Nebraska, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petitions of Mrs. Nellie S. Bunker and other citizens of the Third Congressional district of Maine, pro-

testing against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of Chester County, Pa., and citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Marshallton, Pa., favoring a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John Edenburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Numerous petitions of citizens of the Twenty-fourth Congressional district of the State of New York, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Milford and Swiftwater, mass meeting of Rochester, and others of the State of New Hampshire, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Numerous petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Texas, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Turner J. Bowling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John Chaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Isaac Wil-
lingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of W. De Wald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, for a constitutional amendment defining marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT: Petitions of E. F. Ritter and others, of Venango County, and F. S. Pease and others, of Northeast, Pa., urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petition of citizens and surfmen of Two Rivers, Wis., relating to surfmen of the United States life-saving station—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of people of Waupun, Wis., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of West Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DENNY: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of Maryland, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of citizens of Wheeling and others of the First Congressional district of West Virginia, against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Jerry S. Fish, of Marshall County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Thomas Bumstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREER: Petition of B. F. Kollin, jr., and numerous other citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of West Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petitions of the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Methodist Episcopal and Congregational churches of Wellington Springs, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union and citizens of Hot Springs, S. Dak., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GASTON: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Twenty-sixth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of citizens of Cochran, Pa., and vicinity, for the cessation of hostilities in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petitions of Right Rev. William Craswell Doane and 237 other citizens of Albany, N. Y., against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of the Presbytery of Troy, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Constitution defining marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of women and women's societies of Peoria, Ill., citizens of Princeville, and many others of the Fourteenth Congressional district of Illinois, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Four petitions of Rev. W. R. Campbell and other citizens of the State of Utah; also petitions of citizens of the Second and Tenth wards of Allegheny, Pa., protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of the Ninth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petitions of citizens of North Falmouth, Mass., urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolution of the Southern Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring the passage of laws to further restrict the practice of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROUT: Petitions of F. E. Hayward and voters and citizens of the Second Congressional district of Ohio, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Frank Martin and citizens of Williamstown, Vt., praying for the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Elections.

Also, petition of Frank Martin and 22 citizens, favoring such legislation as will secure to the people adequate antitrust laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Williamstown, Vt., for protection in the use of adulterated food products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Calista F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for an increase of pension to James Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Alexander Wilkie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of F. E. Hayward, of Westminster, N. Y., opposing the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petitions of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Michigan, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Petitions of Rev. J. W. Cowan and other citizens of Eldora, Iowa, and Mrs. Laura Doan Steele, of Mexico, Mo., and numerous other petitions of citizens of the State of Iowa, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of the National Council of the Women of New Zealand, in favor of woman's suffrage in Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petitions of citizens of Clinton and West Hartford, Conn., against seating B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petitions of Rev. John Williamson, J. C. Calhoun, and numerous citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Grand Army post and 28 other citizens of Chariton, Iowa, asking that Mrs. Mary A. Douglass be placed on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: Petition of the New Century Club of Milford, Del., against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of citizens of Allentown and East Millstone, N. J., urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HULL: Resolutions of the Farmers' National Congress, held at Boston, Mass., October 3-10, 1899, in favor of rural free mail delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JETT: Protests of J. M. Truitt, G. B. Smith, Charles Harrison, W. A. Chambers, and numerous other citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional district of Illinois, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of citizens of Walla Walla and others, of the State of Washington, protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: Petitions of citizens of the Third Congressional district of West Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JOY: Paper to accompany House bill to reinstate Lieut. F. H. Hunnicke into the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of E. B. Fairfield and others, of Mansfield, Ohio, against the right of B. H. Roberts to a seat in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Rev. L. A. Robbins and others, of Millbrook, N. Y., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of citizens of Andover, Mass., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LANHAM: Petitions of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Texas, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LENTZ: Petitions of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LONG: Petitions of the Seventh district Federation of Woman's Clubs of Kansas, Aaron Breck, B. H. Moore, and others, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of citizens of Santa Clara County, Cal., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LYBRAND: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of Representative-elect B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: Petition of citizens of Paragould, Ark., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petitions of citizens of the Seventeenth Congressional district of Ohio, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. McPHERSON: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Ninth Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of Faunettsburg, Pa., favoring the passage of laws to further restrict the practice of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Mifflin County, Pa., against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Andrew W. Rogers and others, of Chicago, Ill., asking for the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MARSH: Petitions of citizens of Hancock and McComb counties, Ill., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MERCER: Petitions of Christian Endeavorers of Nebraska and H. C. Beckmeyer, of Arlington, Nebr., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MESICK: Petitions of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Michigan, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Preston H. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of J. Radcliffe and others, of Mountain Spring, Ind.; E. C. Vankirk and others, and citizens of Bloomington, Ind., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MOODY: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Massachusetts, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petitions of C. G. Jordan, L. H. Hudson, J. L. Goodrich, R. L. Palmer, and many other citizens, churches, and societies of the Tenth Congressional district of Ohio, in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MULLER: Petitions of numerous citizens and societies of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of citizens of National City, Cal., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Numerous petitions of citizens of the Fourteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating

of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: Petitions of numerous citizens, churches, and societies of the Sixteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3233, for the relief of Nicholas B. Ireland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3230, to correct the record of Oscar A. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3229, in behalf of the widow of Emmet Stafford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3231, for the relief of Sylvester Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3232, for the relief of David Flinn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Congregational Church of East Bloomfield, N. Y., to forbid the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of the Twenty-eighth Congressional district of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of various churches, missionary societies, and numerous citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Maryland, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also (by request), paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Elizabeth Thomas, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of W. B. Hurlbut and other citizens of the State of Vermont, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petitions of citizens of Sterling, Ill., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Paper to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against Columbus B. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Agnes B. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Martha F. Rixey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill in behalf of the Broad Run Baptist Church, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Waterford Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Isaiah Berdine—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBB: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William F. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petitions of 226 voters of Melrose, Mass., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions, certain churches, and associations in the Third Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petitions of J. W. Burns, C. W. Newton, and several other citizens of Fort Wayne, W. H. Hardman and others, of Lima, Ind., and of the Indiana Conference of the Evangelical Association, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petitions of the New England Southern Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, certain societies and citizens of the Third Congressional district of Connecticut, citizens of Plainville, Lebanon, and other towns in the Third Congressional district of Connecticut, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of employees of the New York Navy-Yard, against the transfer of money appropriated for work at the New York Navy-Yard for other purposes at other places—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Petitions of citizens of the Thirty-second Congressional district of New York, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Paper to accompany House bill correcting the military record of Sylvester W. Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: Petition of A. L. Harrington and other citizens of the First Congressional district of North Carolina, favor-

ing the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petitions of 46 old soldiers of Jackson County, Ill., for a per diem service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petitions of Rev. W. J. Hageman and others, of Wood County, Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of the Methodist and Congregational churches of Cando, N. Dak., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of citizens of Woodbridge, North Haven, and New Haven, Conn., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of women of Attleboro, Mass., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Congregational, Methodist, and Universalist Ministers' Association, with regard to postage on books of public and incorporated libraries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of El Paso, Tex., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: Petitions of numerous citizens, churches, presbyteries, and societies in the Twenty-first Congressional district of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Rev. James Thompson, of Ashland, N. H., and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Hampton, N. H., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petitions of R. A. Evans and other citizens of Meriden, Oxford, and McCook, Nebr., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petitions of citizens of the First Congressional district of Minnesota, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. THAYER: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Third Congressional district of Massachusetts, against the admission of B. H. Roberts to the Fifty-sixth Congress—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petitions of 1,288 citizens, religious organizations, and societies of the Eleventh Congressional district of the State of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Rev. C. J. Almquist, of Arthur, Iowa, and other citizens, in favor of amendments to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy within the United States and disqualifying polygamists, etc.—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Petitions of J. H. Rogers, W. W. Dixon, L. M. Kumler, and other citizens of the Fifteenth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petitions of citizens of Piqua, Troy, and other towns in the Seventh Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petitions of S. E. Bell, J. H. Hurlbut, and citizens of Sterling, Howard, Gardner, Lancaster, and other towns in the Fourth Congressional district of Massachusetts, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: Petitions of James L. Barnwell, of Beaufort; Annie S. Means, of Charleston; Benjamin Chaplin and others, of Hampton County, S. C., praying for the sale of certain bonds now in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, and payment of the proceeds of the sale to them and others from the sale of whose lands said funds arose—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petitions of the Bradford Sunday School Association and citizens of the Fifteenth district of Pennsylvania, against the right of B. H. Roberts to a seat in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the League of Social Service, and Rev. George B. Bell and others, of the Fourth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association of the Pennsylvania Railroad Department, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring

the passage of laws to further restrict the practice of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of James Hagerty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of the Presbyterian, Methodist Episcopal, Episcopal, and other churches of Jeffersonville, Ind., and churches and citizens of the Third Congressional district of Indiana, urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 12, 1899.

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington.

Mr. DONELSON CAFFERY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

FINDINGS BY COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by that court in the cause of James C. Williams, administrator of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by that court in the cause of Parmelia B. Finney, administratrix of T. C. Finney, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of Emma R. Bailey, executrix of John J. Bailey, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF NAVIGATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting the report of Elmer L. Corthell, a delegate from the United States to the Seventh International Congress of Navigation, held at Brussels, Belgium, July 18, 1898; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

MEDICAL SERVICE OF GERMAN ARMY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 6th instant, a copy of the report of Dr. McG. Woodbury on the medical service of the German army; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

COMMANDER JOSHUA BISHOP.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of the Navy; which was read:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, December 9, 1899.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the petition of Joshua Bishop, commander, United States Navy, retired.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, Secretary.

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HOAR subsequently said: I wish to call attention to rather a remarkable breach of our rules. It is a matter very unimportant in itself. It is that the head of one of the Departments transmits to the Senate the petition of a citizen who, I believe, is an officer under that Department.

The rule of the Senate requires that the petition shall be presented by a member; that it shall be presented under certain conditions; that it shall be indorsed in a certain fashion and presented at a certain time. I do not understand that it is the privilege of any Executive Department to undertake to determine the charac-

ter or quality of a petition that should be presented, and that we should receive it as of course when so transmitted.

I merely call attention to this irregularity, not as having any importance whatever at present, but that it may not form a precedent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Do I understand the Senator from Massachusetts to think that if an officer in the Navy desires some action by Congress there is any impropriety in having that request transmitted to this body by the Secretary of the Navy? Where is the harm?

Mr. HOAR. It is contrary to the Senate rule. It should be transmitted to some member of the body and by him presented.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it is to be treated strictly as a petition, I agree.

Mr. HOAR. It is. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it is not in proper form, that is another matter; but I conceive that a request by any naval officer for legislation for his benefit or for the benefit of the service may very wisely be submitted to the Secretary of the Navy and may very properly be transmitted by the Secretary of the Navy to Congress.

Mr. HOAR. There is no indorsement on this petition. It is a mere transmission of the petition of a citizen, who is a naval officer. What the Senator from New Hampshire says might wisely be done and is undoubtedly done in many cases; but this petition comes here contrary to our rule, which is that every petition or memorial shall contain so and so; that it shall be signed by the petitioner; that it shall have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, which this petition has not; and that it shall be presented and referred without debate. It is a very clear case.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have not had an opportunity to examine the petition, which I see is receiving the scrutiny of the President pro tempore of the Senate; but if it is in the form of a petition to Congress, then I quite agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it ought to be presented through a member of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. That is all of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I then only repeat that a proper request for legislation by a naval officer or by an army officer may very properly be transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War with or without his indorsement.

Mr. HOAR. But not as a petition.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not as a petition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not examine the paper particularly. There are quite a number of accompanying papers.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented the petitions of W. H. Clark and 36 other citizens of Charleston, of Rev. William Wood and 40 other citizens of Boothbay Harbor, D. E. French and 88 other citizens of Hampden, Truman S. Perry and 18 other citizens of Waterford, Henry H. Noyes and 36 other citizens of New Gloucester, Rev. W. H. Rice and 23 other citizens, Rev. W. W. Hayden and 17 other citizens of Madison, F. E. Eashman and 13 other citizens of Portland, C. M. Herring and 19 other citizens of Brunswick, Rev. L. A. Jones and 18 other citizens of South Limington, Jasper Hardy and 15 other citizens, Henry L. Chapman and 18 other citizens of Brunswick, Norman La Marsh and 33 other citizens of Castine, and of Rev. W. C. Westcott and 39 other citizens of Winter Harbor, all in the State of Maine, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented the petitions of John M. McElmoyle and sundry other citizens of Elkton, of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Elkton, and of Fannie E. Pridham and sundry other citizens of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the petitions of A. J. Hutchinson and 46 other citizens of Milford, R. L. Duston and 10 other citizens of Portsmouth, A. E. Lambert and 17 other citizens of Wetford, W. W. Cole and 18 other citizens, C. V. French and 5 other citizens of Cornish Flat, A. D. Lee and 34 other citizens of Meredith, C. W. Watley and 31 other citizens of Campton, B. A. Willmott and 15 other citizens of Lee, H. H. Porter and 18 other citizens of Littleton, J. W. Reed and 8 other citizens of Stoddard, and of A. F. Grow and 39 other citizens, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BATE presented the petitions of Rev. J. B. Eshman and 53 other citizens of Howell, J. H. Graham and 11 other citizens of Pomona, W. T. Hart and 46 other citizens of Swanbluff, William Ward and 18 other citizens of Whitehorn, C. B. Waller and 18 other citizens of Fallbranch, Rev. S. V. Lowe and 19 other citizens of Rutledge, W. N. Brown and 80 other citizens of Brakehill, A. T.